

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 385 856

CS 215 006

AUTHOR Alper, Neil O.; Wassall, Gregory H.
TITLE The Write Stuff: Employment and Earnings of Authors, 1970 to 1990.
SPONS AGENCY National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Dec 94
CONTRACT 93-41
NOTE 202p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Authors; *Employment Patterns; Higher Education; Occupational Surveys; Salary Wage Differentials; Sex Differences; Wages; Writing Research
IDENTIFIERS Professional Concerns; *Professional Writing

ABSTRACT

A study surveyed and synthesized available information about the employment and earnings of authors over the 1970-1990 period. Data came from United States and other government censuses, a variety of surveys of authors, and from records of writers' unions and professional organizations. Results indicated that: (1) the author occupation is growing rapidly; (2) authors are concentrated in states along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts; (3) members of the author profession are well educated; (4) authors had higher rates of unemployment than other professional and technical workers, but lower rates than other artists; (5) compared to the average artist and the average professional and technical worker, authors were far more likely to be self-employed and less likely to work for private sector employers; (6) real personal income fell by \$924 between 1969 and 1989; (7) significant disparities exist between the average earnings of men and women authors; (8) differences in earnings among White, Black, and Hispanic authors were smaller; (9) multiple job holding rates for authors in the United States and other countries were higher than for all other professional workers; (10) authors are primarily white with an average age around 40 years old; and (11) general patterns for authors in the United States tended to hold for authors in other parts of the world. (Contains 42 references and 75 tables of data.) (RS)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

THE WRITE STUFF: EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS OF AUTHORS, 1970 TO 1990

- Draft -

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Neil O. Alper
Gregory H. Wassall

December, 1994

This report was prepared for the National Endowment for the Arts under contract number 93-41. The authors are grateful for the research assistance of Anwiti Bahaguna and David Mills in its preparation. The opinions expressed in this report are those of the authors and not necessarily these of the Endowment.

CS 215006

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Chapter 1. AUTHORS IN THE LABOR MARKET.

Chapter 2. AUTHORS IN THE U. S. CENSUS, 1970 TO 1990.

What Census Data Are Used to Analyze Authors' Work Experiences
Issues in Using Census Data to Analyze Artists' Work Experiences
Authors in the Census: Whom Does the Census Define as an Author?
Size and Growth in the Author Profession
Where Authors Work: Regional Distribution
For Whom Authors Work: Distribution by Industry
Demographic Characteristics of Authors
Authors in the Labor Market
Earnings of Authors
Variability in Authors' Earnings
Other Sources of Income
Earnings and Income by Gender, Race and Ethnicity
Why Do Authors' Earnings Differ from Those of Other Artists: A Statistical
Analysis

Chapter 3. AUTHORS IN THE U.S. AND ELSEWHERE

Current Population Survey
Non-Census Surveys
 A. General Artist Surveys
 A.1 Alper-Wassall New England Survey
 A.2 Columbia University's Research Center for Arts and Culture Survey
 B. Special Artist Surveys
 C. Administrative Records
Studies of Writers in Other Countries
 A. Australia
 B. Canada
 C. United Kingdom
 D. France
 E. Finland

Bibliography

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report surveys and synthesizes available information about the employment and earnings of authors over the 1970-1990 period. Data discussed in this report have come from the U.S. and other government censuses, a variety of surveys of authors, and from records of writers' unions and professional organizations. The sources are quite diverse. In comparing statistics among surveys and censuses, the diversity in definitions, sampling procedures and sample sizes should be kept in mind.

Evidence on Authors from the 1970, 1980 and 1990 Census

The U. S. Census affords several advantages in studying the labor market experiences and earnings of authors. The survey methodology is excellent, the number of persons surveyed is large enough to permit analyses of small occupational groups such as authors, and a consistent body of data is available for comparison among occupations and from decade to decade.

However, several shortcomings in using Census data to evaluate the labor market experiences of artists have been pointed out by social scientists. Some Census artist occupational categories are too broad, although this is not a serious problem with the author category. Also, because the Census requires every worker to declare only one occupation, all work experiences and earnings in a given year are attributed to that occupation. For authors, this procedure leads to an overstatement of work effort and

earnings from writing, because direct surveys have turned up significant percentages working in other occupations in a given year. This problem applies to many other artist professions as well.

The author occupation is growing rapidly. Between 1970 and 1990, their numbers increased by 285 percent. By comparison, the growth in the professional labor force was 89 percent and the growth in the entire labor force was 54 percent over the same period. About half of this phenomenal growth occurred recently, between 1985 and 1990. Nevertheless, authors still constitute a very small fraction of the nation's labor force; in 1990, 9 in 10,000 members of the labor force were authors.

Relative to the entire labor force, authors are concentrated in states along the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Over the 1970-1990 period, this concentration lessened somewhat. California and New York are home to more authors than other states; in addition, they are the two states with the highest percentage of authors in their labor forces. The Los Angeles and New York City metropolitan area have the highest percentages of authors in their labor forces, and the greatest number of authors, of any metropolitan areas in the country.

Using Census data, it is possible compare the employment and earnings of members of one occupation to members of related occupations. Throughout, we compare authors to (1) all artists, (2) editors and reporters, (3) technical writers and (4) all professional and technical workers other than artists, in order to provide benchmarks for the author statistics we present. It is also possible to choose among alternative descriptions of membership in an occupation. The following statistics,

unless otherwise noted, are drawn from the broadest definition of authors and members of related professions: all persons who indicated occupational membership, regardless of whether they were in the labor force at the time of the Census. About 14 percent of all professional and technical workers, and 14 percent of authors as well, indicated occupational affiliation despite not being members of the labor force (i. e., neither working nor actively seeking work) in 1990.

Members of the author profession are well educated. In 1990 they averaged 15.8 years of education, more than other artists and other professional and technical workers. Authors are also older; their average age of 44 years exceeded that of artists by 5 years and that of other professional and technical workers by 4 years. In 1990, half of all authors were men and 95 percent were white. These percentages were higher than those of other professional and technical workers. Over the 1970-1990 period, the author profession had a lower percentage of minorities than artists or other professional and technical occupations. It contained a higher percentage of women than did the artist profession but a lower percentage than did other professional and technical occupations.

Authors had higher rates of unemployment than other professional and technical workers, but lower rates than other artists. Compared to other professionals, authors worked fewer hours per week and fewer weeks per year. In 1990, only 40 percent worked full-time year-round (working at least 35 hours per week and 50 weeks per year). By comparison, 46 percent of artists and 56 percent of other professional and technical workers worked full-time. The percentage of full-time authors has fallen since

1970; the percentages of full-time workers in the other occupations have risen over the same period. Compared to the average artist and the average professional and technical worker, authors were far more likely to be self-employed, and less likely to work for private sector employers.

As a consequence of its higher rates of self-employment, the author profession receives a higher percentage of its earnings from self-employment. Self-employment earnings still were typically less than half of authors' total earnings. In 1989, authors' total earnings were \$23,335. (Earnings and income data are annual averages, and refer to the year prior to the Census.) In both 1979 and 1989 authors earned less than other professional and technical workers, and less than editors and reporters and technical writers. In 1969 and 1989 they earned more than other artists.

Because authors worked fewer hours per year than members of the other reference occupations, a computed hourly wage shows authors earning more per hour than members of the other reference groups in all three Census years. Census data also show that authors' total personal incomes are higher than those of all artists but lower (except in 1969) than those of other professional and technical workers. The gap between author and other professional and technical worker personal incomes is smaller than the earnings gap. The average total personal income of authors in 1989 was \$30,089. Authors led all reference groups in total household income in all three Census years. In 1989, their average total household income was \$62,083.

Between 1969 and 1989, the earnings of authors grew by 175 percent. This earnings growth lagged behind that of the other reference occupations, and it lagged

behind changes in the Consumer Price Index. In constant 1969 dollars, the real earnings of authors fell by \$1,567. The earnings of other reference groups, except for other professional and technical workers, also fell over this period.

Similar trends were found in total personal income. Real personal income of authors fell by \$924 between 1969 and 1989. The real personal income of the reference occupational groups, except those of other professional and technical workers, also fell. Authors' household income, however, outpaced inflation; their real household income rose by \$2,370 over the period. In fact, all reference occupations showed increases in real household income. The primary reason for this phenomenon is the rising labor force participation of women over this period.

One interesting characteristic of authors' earnings is their relative inequality. In 1989 a higher percentage of authors had zero or negative earnings, and a higher percentage earned over \$90,000, than any of the other reference occupational groups. Essentially the same earnings distribution, relative to the other occupational groups, was found in 1979 and 1969.

The same array of statistics was examined for authors in the experienced civilian labor force, and for authors who worked full-time year-round. Arguments have been made by some observers, including ourselves, that the complete employment and earnings picture of artists is not fully revealed when we consider only artists who qualify as members of the labor force. Nevertheless, we found that authors' economic success relative to members of other occupations is not affected when the sample is limited to members of the experienced civilian labor force. For example, authors in the

experienced civilian labor force earned \$25,800 in 1989, or \$2,465 more than all authors (i. e., including authors out of the labor force in 1990). But other occupations, when limited to members in the labor force, experienced comparable earnings increases. Personal income and household income rankings did not change either. The average personal income of authors in the experienced civilian labor force in 1989 was \$31,788; their average household income was \$63,019.

Comparing only authors and members of other professions who work full-time year-round has the advantage of minimizing earnings differences caused solely by different amounts of time worked per year. Authors, as we have indicated, worked fewer hours per year. As a result, the annual earnings of full-time authors compare more favorably to their counterparts in other occupations. For example, in 1989, full-time authors' earnings of \$35,896 placed them above artists, editors and reporters and technical writers, and below only other professional and technical workers.

Differences in earnings and income by gender, race and ethnicity were also examined. Given the small size of the author profession and the relatively small percentage of minorities working as authors, racial and ethnic comparisons were made only among white, black and Hispanic authors. In all three Census years, significant disparities between the average earnings of men and women authors were found. The earnings disparity narrowed between 1969 and 1989, but still remained significant. In 1989 women's earnings were only 52 percent of men's. Differences in median earnings (and wages) were smaller, indicating more men were concentrated in the high earnings (and hourly wage) region. Gender differences in personal and household incomes

were smaller. In fact, women authors had higher household income.

Differences in earnings among white, black and Hispanic authors were smaller. In 1989, black authors' earnings were 91 percent of white authors' earnings. Hispanic authors earnings were 87 percent of white authors' earnings. There were greater disparities in personal income and in household income between white and minority authors. For example, the ratio of black to white authors' personal income was 85 percent, and the ratio of Hispanic to white authors' personal income was 80 percent.

Evidence on Authors' Multiple Job Holding

As already mentioned above, even with the advantages of the U.S. Census it does not provide a complete picture of the economic behavior of authors and other artists. The primary shortcoming is its inability to identify the importance of working in other occupations on the authors' economic welfare and the amount of time spent in these activities.

The Census Bureau's Current Population Survey, even with its lack of reliability for authors and the other artistic occupations because of its sample size, consistently found high multiple job holding rates for authors and artists. From the mid-1980s to the early 1990s, multiple job holding rates for authors were higher than for all other professional workers. In 1991 the multiple job holding rate for authors was double the rate of all artists, almost three times the rate of all other professionals, and almost four times the rate of the total work force. In 1991 one in five authors, or 21.3 percent, indicated that they held more than one job with the most common job being teaching.

The evidence from non-census surveys of authors, or artists including authors,

confirms that writers' labor market behavior in a given year involves working at more than one job. Alper-Wassall's survey of New England artists, undertaken in 1981 and 1982, found that while every author spent some time during the year writing, only one in five were full-time writers and the majority worked in a job related to their writing some time during the year. The writing related job was primarily teaching. Additionally, 45 percent held jobs unrelated to their writing. The evidence supports the fact that several of these work activities were done simultaneously. Columbia University's Research Center for Arts and Culture survey, undertaken in 1989, found that 90 percent of the writers needed to work at some non-writing job to support their writing and that almost half were multiple job holders at the time they were surveyed. Findings of similar behavior were identified in the Columbia Survey of American Authors done for the Authors' Guild in 1979. It found that 70 percent of authors had earnings from non-writing work, and that almost half held regular salaried positions not as writers. Like the other studies, it found that the majority (90 percent) of those who had second jobs held professional jobs, not the traditional service or clerical jobs of the stereotypical "starving artist."

Surveys of authors in other countries suggest that multiple job holding for writers is not a uniquely U.S. phenomenon. A study of the members of the British Society of Authors and the Writers' Guild found that only 17 percent of authors worked only as writers and that 67 percent of those surveyed identified writing as a secondary occupation. A French study found that 30 percent of the authors worked at another trade during the survey year, and that 70 percent had done so at some time during their

writing career. In Finland, only 22 percent of the authors indicated that they were full-time writers, and fully half indicated a non-writing occupation for tax purposes.

The importance of authors' multiple job holding behavior is best determined by examining its impact on their economic well-being. Alper-Wassall found that two-thirds of the authors' labor market earnings and almost 60 percent of their total income comes from working in a non-writing job. The Columbia Research Center's study data suggests that non-writing income, labor and non-labor income combined, account for almost 80 percent of total writers' income, leaving writing to contribute, on average, about 20 percent. Columbia's study for the Authors' Guild reported that median writing income comprised 33 percent of median total personal income, and for the group of writers most committed to writing, those whom the authors call the "committed full-timers," writing income was only 77 percent of total income. Without working at other jobs that are often held concurrently with working as a writer, clearly the economic well-being of authors would be much worse and that most would be classified as poor. While we do not have the same evidence for writers in other countries, it would be safe to assume that their economic welfare is significantly enhanced by working at other jobs as well.

Evidence on Authors from Non-Census Sources

The value of non-census surveys goes beyond their ability to examine the rather unique labor market behavior of authors and other artists. What follows is a summary of additional findings from the three surveys already discussed and three studies utilizing the administrative records of the Writers Guild of America, west, a union for

writers in the television, radio and film industries.

Regarding the demographic characteristics of authors there is a generally consistent pattern across all the studies. Authors are primarily white with an average age around 40 years old. The proportion non-white seems to be increasing. The two earliest studies (Columbia's Authors' Guild and Alper-Wassall) found approximately 3 percent non-white authors; the later survey (Columbia's Research Center) found almost 10 percent non-white; and the union's administrative records showed almost a doubling in the number of minority members from 1986 to 1991.

The gender composition of the profession appears to be changing as well. The earliest of the studies found that 60 percent of the authors were female. Alper-Wassall found an even distribution, and the latest survey (Columbia's Research Center) found the occupation to be 60 percent female. The union's administrative records suggest an increase in female writers employed from 1982 to 1991, but they accounted for only 22 percent of the employed writers in 1991.

Writers, like their artistic colleagues, are very well-educated compared with the general population. This is a consistent finding for all the surveys. Alper-Wassall found that they were better educated than both performers and visual artists. They were also found, by both Alper-Wassall and Columbia's Research Center, to have started their training to be writers at around the age of 16, which is considerably older than performers but about the same as visual artists.

While the writers' labor market experiences and resulting income have already been discussed there are some additional findings that are important to note. Two of

the surveys, Columbia's Authors' Guild study and Alper-Wassall, found the income of other family members to be important in explaining the ability of writers to work at their writing, and that family income for the writers was well above the poverty thresholds at the time of the surveys.

An additional impact on writers economic well-being is the cost they incur to write. Alper-Wassall and Columbia's Research Center surveys found that these costs often exceeded the writers' earnings from writing. Alper-Wassall found that writing earnings net of costs averaged half of the writing earnings, and when examining medians, that median writing earnings net of costs were negative. Columbia's Research Center's findings were similar, it found that only about 43 percent of the writers had writing income that exceeded their costs.

A difference in income associated with the writer's gender was also a consistent finding. Female authors consistently earned less than male authors. Columbia's Authors' Guild study found that female authors' median earnings from writing was 77 percent of the male median. This was a considerably smaller difference than the Alper-Wassall finding where female authors' average earnings from their writing were only 20 percent of their male colleagues' earnings. This difference was not as large when adjustments were made for the amount of time spent writing (i.e., women spent much less time during the year). Alper-Wassall's estimated differential for hourly wage was that women writers earned about 40 percent of male earnings. The three Writers' Guild studies identified differentials more in line with the Authors' Guild study. They also found that they fluctuate over time. In 1982 median female earnings were 73 percent of

male earnings; in 1986 they were about 60 percent of male earnings; and in 1991 they were about 75 percent of male earnings.

Another finding that is supported by the two studies, i.e., Columbia's Authors' Guild study and the Writers' Guild studies, that were specifically tailored to the authors' experiences is that considerable differences exist in earnings related to the type of writing the author does and for whom they work. The Authors' Guild study found that poets earn the least from their writing, authors of "academically oriented nonfiction" were slightly better off, children's books writers and writers of general adult fiction were in the middle, while the writers of "genre" fiction earned the most. The Writers' Guild studies found that writers in television tended to earn more than writers in film, but the difference narrowed quite a bit over the decade of the studies to where the difference was only 3 percent in 1991. Greater differences were found in earnings based on the type of firm the writer worked for, regardless of whether it was in television or film. Writers who worked for the major television or film production companies earned considerably more. In 1991, for example, writers working for the major film producers had median earnings that were 115 percent higher than their colleagues working for the smaller independent film producers.

Evidence from Authors in Other Countries

The general patterns that were found for authors in the U.S., including their multiple job holding experiences previously discussed, tend to hold for authors in other parts of the world. This, of course, tends to ignore the differences in definitions that exist among the censuses and surveys that are used to collect this information.

The number of authors in other countries is also very small. In Australia and Canada, where census data is also available, they accounted for less than one-third of a percent of the labor force (in the U.S. they were less than one-tenth of a percent). Like in the U.S. the majority of writers in Canada, Finland and Australia were men, with about 55 percent of the writers being male. In France the majority are also male, but the proportion male is much larger, about 80 percent. In several countries, as in the U.S., the proportion female has been growing.

In all the countries in with information available on schooling, authors were found to be very well educated. In Australia 44 percent of the authors had earned the highest degree reported in the census, compared to 8 percent for the total work force. In Canada in 1981, 42 percent had earned bachelors' degrees while for the entire work force only 10 percent had done so. This pattern was also found for authors in both Finland and France.

In all the countries studied female authors' income was less than their male colleagues' income. The differential in some countries was considerably less than in the U.S. where the median income for female writers was 52 percent of their male colleagues' income. In Australia in 1986 female writers' income was approximately 80 percent of their male colleagues.' In Canada, in 1980, female writers' income was about 65 percent of the male colleagues.' Even in Finland in 1984, where there exist extensive public programs to support all artists, including writers, female writers had an income that was 68 percent of male writers.

CHAPTER 1

AUTHORS IN THE LABOR MARKET

In this report we survey and synthesize the existing body of knowledge on the employment and earnings of authors between the years 1970 and 1990. Most of the information discussed herein comes from the U. S. Census or from surveys that were directed specifically at American authors or at groups of American artists, including authors. Some information about authors in other countries is integrated into this report as well.

This report was commissioned by the National Endowment for the Arts. Its interest in the author profession lies both in its role of supporting research to enable a better understanding of the nature of the artist work force in general, and in its special interest in writers through its Literature Program, which has supported writers through fellowships and other means for several decades.

According to the U.S. Census, there are about 107,000 authors in America. Despite their numbers, there are probably few other occupations in which one encounters such a high ratio of anecdotal information to hard facts. There exist members of almost any occupation who write about what it is like to work in that occupation. Since authors write for a living, many have described what it is like to earn (or fail to earn) one's living as an author. These descriptions are accurate, often

compelling, and no doubt more interesting than most readers will find this report, but do not convey a broad statistical perspective of the author profession.

There also exist numerous books and other publications designed to assist authors in writing, polishing, and selling their work, in finding agents, and in locating likely destinations for their output. These sources reveal a great deal about how the profession interacts with its interfaces, and are quite useful in helping non-authors to gain insight into the nuts and bolts of the profession.

Also, successful authors are frequently in the news. Winners of the major prizes for writing receive press coverage. Best selling authors are interviewed on television talk shows, and appear at book signings and readings in book stores and elsewhere from coast to coast. Those authors fortunate enough to command high rates of compensation are the subject of news stories as well. While writing this report we encountered a news story about a second instance of a sale of a film script for more than \$4 million. And, as we were completing this report it was impossible to ignore coverage of the \$4.5 million advance offered by Harper Collins to part-time author Newt Gingrich, and his subsequent decision to decline the offer. Although the public seems to know that these authors are not typical of their profession, it seems to be less clear about who or what is typical.

Given the notoriety and the overall public interest in this profession, it is surprising that very little hard statistical information about writers has made its way to those likely to be interested in it: social scientists, policy analysts and policy makers, and certainly writers themselves. This report does not answer every question that

might be raised about the author profession, or even many of those relating directly to employment and earnings. We do not claim to possess any special insight into what it is like to be an author, despite writing non-fiction works ourselves. All the information we cite is second-hand; no data collection was done with publication in this report in mind. What we have tried to do is to put together and compare the extant statistical information about how authors go about making a living and how successful they are at accomplishing that objective.

There is no single accepted definition of the author profession. A working definition of the literature field suggested by the NEA's Literature Field Overview Study (1994, p. 1) embraced the following areas: poetry, fiction and creative nonfiction, in English or in translation. The U. S. Census defines an author occupation that clearly encompasses more than the definition just cited. With specific studies done of or commissioned by author/writer groups, the working definition of the occupation is typically narrow. Those surveys of artists which include writers often use a broader definition.

The remainder of this report is organized in the following way. In Chapter 2, we discuss the information available about authors in the 1970, 1980 and 1990 U.S. Census, especially its Public Use Microdata Samples. Most of the information we present is the product of statistical tabulations and computations done for this report, and thus not previously available to the public.

The Census is the most comprehensive source of information about authors, and many other professions, in this country. It has its shortcomings, however, in this role.

Designed to glean information of general interest from all Americans, its questionnaire cannot possibly be tailored to the nuances of different occupations. The most serious shortcoming it has in this regard, as it relates to authors, is its inability to account for employment and earnings in secondary occupations when a jobholder works in more than one occupation in a year. The ability to use Census data to draw comparisons both over time and among occupations are advantages which we attempt to exploit in our analysis.

In Chapter 3, we discuss the findings of diverse sources of information about authors. The American sources include surveys of artists which included authors, surveys of members of the author profession, and information about authors taken from union or professional organization data bases. They also include the annual Current Population Survey, which provides limited information about multiple job-holding among occupations. International sources include many of the above plus federal census data. Each of these sources has its unique strengths and weaknesses; to some degree one source's strength is another's weakness. Like the U.S. Census, surveys of artists can not probe as deeply into the idiosyncrasies of the methods authors employ to earn a living as might a survey of authors only. They may not ask about royalty income, or earnings from readings, for example. But they provide valuable reference information since they offer comparable data for similar occupations.

Surveys of authors give us more detail about personal characteristics, working conditions and earnings. Typically they have been one-shot surveys using questionnaires tailored for that specific purpose. Their findings cannot be readily

compared to other data sources; their sampling methodology is often neither representative nor random, and not intended to be.

Even more detail on time worked and earnings can be gleaned from records of authors' unions and professional organizations. These sources, however, offer little personal or household demographic information, and may not even provide information on sources of income other than through union recognized activity.

International information on authors has its own unique attributes. The nature of the author profession varies among countries, and surveys in other countries often choose occupational definitions at odds with choices often made in U.S. survey work. Nevertheless, their findings are often illuminating and surprisingly consistent.

It is hoped that, by consolidating the information from these diverse sources in one report, some sense may be made of the author profession. Obviously, it is up to the reader to determine whether we have been successful.

CHAPTER 2

AUTHORS IN THE U. S. CENSUS, 1970 TO 1990

In this chapter we present and analyze evidence on the employment, earnings and other labor market and related characteristics of authors using information in the 1970, 1980 and 1990 U.S. Census. This evidence is also presented separately for men, women, white, black, and Hispanic authors. In addition to examining authors in detail, we compare authors to members of several other occupations. First, authors are compared to all artists, using the definition of artist employed by the National Endowment for the Arts.¹ In this comparison, we leave authors in the artist sample. Second, we compare authors to all professional and technical workers, excluding artists, and to two specific occupations in this latter category with similar characteristics to authors: editors and reporters, and technical writers.

In the next chapter, we examine other sources of information on the employment and earnings of authors, and compare them to each other and to our findings from the Census. In order to understand fully the distinctions among the various data sources which we will discuss, it is important to understand the procedures used to develop each source. Immediately below, we describe the Census data collection procedures, and discuss the strengths and weaknesses of using the Census to analyze the work experiences of authors, artists, and other professional workers.

What Census Data Are Used to Analyze Authors' Work Experiences

¹How the NEA defines the term artist using Census occupational categories is explained below.

Most of the information we report on in this chapter is derived from the 1970, 1980, and 1990 Census Public Use Microdata Samples (often simply called PUMS). Each contains a sample of the responses from households who completed the Census long form questionnaires. In each Census year, only a minority of households are asked to complete the long form. For example, in the 1990 Census, approximately 16 percent of all households received long form questionnaires. The long form questionnaire asks for extensive information about housing and personal characteristics of each member of the household. In 1990 the Census long form contained 26 housing questions and 33 personal questions. Many of these questions, in turn, contained several parts.

Among the data releases by the Census Bureau after each decennial Census, the PUMS is unique in that the unit of observation is the household and person record. Other Census data releases provide aggregated information, typically over a geographical unit, such as a state, county or metropolitan area. In the PUMS, because information about individuals is revealed, several steps are taken to insure anonymity, including the provision of less detail about geographic location than is often available in other Census releases using aggregated data. PUMS data are invaluable to researchers; they can use this sample, or selected parts of it, to perform their own statistical analyses. In this sense, the PUMS is analogous to the surveys of authors that we report on in the next chapter.

Public Use Microdata Samples have been produced and made available in computer readable format for every U.S. Census since 1940. The 1940 and 1950 PUMS were retrospectively created from microfilmed individual Census forms in a joint undertaking of the Census Bureau and the Center for Demography and Ecology at the University of Wisconsin. Starting with the 1960 Census, the Census Bureau has released PUMS data tapes, with a lag

of several years, after completing the survey phase of the Census.

Since the inception of the Public Use Samples, the Census Bureau has extracted different sized samples for researchers to work with. To some degree, these sample sizes have been conditioned by the ability of contemporary computer systems to store and process the data. For the 1940, 1950 and 1960 Census, a one percent sample was extracted from the larger group of households who completed long form questionnaires. In 1970, six individual one percent samples were extracted. Each one percent sample, independently drawn, was chosen from data collected using one of two questionnaires, and one of three geographic samples.² In 1980 and 1990, both a basic five percent sample and a supplemental one percent sample were drawn.³

As noted, the analysis that we perform in this chapter utilizes data in the Public Use Samples from 1970 to 1990. Specifically, for 1970 we utilize a four percent sample (i. e., four one-percent samples), and for 1980 and 1990, we utilize the basic five percent samples.

Over the 1940-1990 time period, there have been significant changes in the Census survey methodology, the nature and content of the questions asked, and the occupational and industrial classification codes. The most significant of these changes occurred prior to the 1970 Census. Since 1970, essentially the same information has been requested of respondents on the long form questionnaires. In addition, the occupational and industrial categories into which every member of the labor force is placed have changed relatively little.

²Three one percent samples were drawn using one questionnaire, and three one percent samples were drawn using a second questionnaire. The two questionnaires contained both a set of common questions and sets of differing questions. For each type of questionnaire, each one percent sample focused on different geographic information: states, county groups, and neighborhoods.

³In 1980, the supplemental one percent sample focused exclusively on the elderly population. In 1990, the supplemental one percent sample, like the five percent sample, was based on a random selection of respondents who completed the long form questionnaire.

This enables us to make direct comparisons of information across all three Census years. We note below those few cases where changes in the nature of the information collected may affect or bias conclusions drawn therefrom.

In the next section, we discuss problems that arise in using Census data to study the labor force participation and earnings of artists. Before moving there, we pause to note the principal advantages of using Census Public Use Microdata. First, the Census sampling and information collection and tabulation procedures are very sophisticated; information gained in the PUMS can be generalized to the entire population with relatively small margins of error. Second, samples are large; most other random surveys of the U.S. population do not sample enough persons to permit analyses of small occupations such as artists, let alone authors. Third, the information obtained from the Census is vast; a wide variety of questions are asked on the long form questionnaire. Fourth, although the Census is not a longitudinal survey, it provides us with consistent observations on a large sample of the population every ten years. This enables many types of comparisons over time.

Issues in Using Census Data to Analyze Artists' Work Experiences

Controversies over using Census data to analyze labor market outcomes of artists revolve around the manner in which occupations are defined. Before turning to these controversies and to their relevance to the author profession, it is useful to examine the process by which a respondent's choices in the Census questionnaire lead to his or her classification into an occupational category. A 1990 long form respondent was asked to "(d)escribe this person's chief job activity or business last week. If this person had more than one job, describe the one at which the person worked the most hours. If this person had no job or business last week, give information for his/her last job or business since 1985." In

addition, the respondent was asked to name the employer, describe the industry, name the occupation and describe the most important duties of the occupation. Respondents were led through a very similar series of questions in prior Census questionnaires.

Thus a person's choice of occupation is determined by his or her response to a request for information on work activity "last week." Further, occupation is self-defined; i. e., the respondent names the occupation rather than picks the best available choice from a list. The Census then assigns the respondent's self-defined occupation to an existing classification (or creates a new one if warranted). Thus an *occupational classification* consists of a number of individual but related *occupations*. In the discussion below, we will adhere to this terminology.

An important characteristic of the Census procedure is that it forces the respondent to select *one occupation only*. Those who worked at more than one job during the reference week are required to choose only one; that at which the most time was spent during the week.

The use of Census data to analyze labor supply, incomes, and other labor market characteristics of artists has been challenged by some social scientists.⁴ They raise two principal criticisms of the Census methodology: (1) that the Census (and the National Endowment) defines the term "artist" too broadly, and (2) that the Census mis-classifies or ignores some artists because of frequent multiple job-holding in most artistic occupations.

The first criticism -- excessive breadth in the artist occupational definitions -- in turn has two parts. The first is directed at the choice of which Census occupational categories are defined as "artistic." The second is directed at the scope of some of the individual categories.

The Census does not actually define the term "artist." The eleven Census occupational categories associated with the term "artist" are the product of the National Endowment for the

⁴An earlier summary of this debate is found in Waits and McNertney (1989).

Arts. The decision of the NEA to include these eleven occupational categories is based on which occupations have traditionally comprised its artistic constituency. However, it is instructive to learn how the Census itself classifies these categories.

The occupational classification system used by the 1980 and 1990 Census creates six broad groups. One of these, called "Managerial and Professional Specialty Occupations," contains all eleven artist occupations.⁵ Most artist categories embraced by the NEA taxonomy are found in a narrower group of occupational categories entitled "Writers, Artists, Entertainers, and Athletes." Included in the NEA definition of artist from within this group are : (1) actors and directors, (2) announcers, (3) authors, (4) dancers, (5) designers, (6) musicians and composers, (7) painters, sculptors, craft-artists and artist printmakers, (8) photographers, and (9) artists, performers, and related workers, not elsewhere classified.⁶ To complete the set of eleven artistic occupational categories, the following are added: (10) architects (found under "Engineers, Architects, and Surveyors") and (11) college and university art, drama, and music teachers (found under "Teachers, Postsecondary").

Accepting these eleven occupational categories above as encompassing the artistic work force, we arrive at the second component of the excessive breadth criticism: that the categories themselves are often too broad. This criticism applies to some more than others. Perhaps the worst offender is the artists not elsewhere classified category, which contains what most would regard as occupations on the fringe of art and entertainment. Among the occupations it embraces are astrologer, clairvoyant, freak, lion tamer, rodeo rider, snake

⁵The 1970 Census used a different classification system, one which comprised thirteen broad occupational groups. The group containing all artist occupations was called "Professional, Technical and Kindred Workers."

⁶Also in this group, but not included in the artist definition, are technical writers, editors and reporters, public relations specialists, and athletes.

charmer and tattooer. Some other occupational categories have been noted for their all-encompassing nature; the dancers category, for example, includes go-go girl, strip teaser and square dance caller. Others, such as architects and radio and television announcers, are sufficiently narrow and well-defined that the excessive breadth issue does not arise.

Between these two extremes lies the Census authors category. As authors are the focus of this study, this category will be examined in greater detail below.

The other criticism of using Census data to analyze the work experiences of artists lies in its treatment of multiple job-holding. The Census questionnaire forces a respondent to choose only one occupation, and his or her entire labor market experiences for the previous calendar year are then attributed to that occupation. In general, this procedure seems reasonable, since most people work in only one occupation during a given year.⁷ Those that work in more than one are steered into choosing the one they were working at, or spent the most time working at, during the reference week. However, this process precludes the respondent from providing any information on other jobs held during the reference week, or during the year for that matter.

In an important way, this treatment of multiple job-holders is less than satisfactory. Consider an example. Suppose that people who call themselves authors hold non-writing jobs as well in a calendar year. By attributing all time spent working and all earnings for an entire year to the author occupation, the Census overestimates the importance of that occupation in a person's total work effort and earnings. One might counter by arguing that there must be, say, waiters and high school English teachers who write in their spare time and earn some money from writing, yet who identify themselves as waiters and high school English teachers

⁷Evidence from the annual Current Population Survey, also conducted by the Bureau of the Census, shows that only 6.2 percent of the labor force worked in two or more occupations in 1989.

in the Census. Don't these situations offset each other?

Statistically, these two situations are not offsetting. The Census tally of the number of authors would seem to be accurate, since only those for whom writing is their principal work (at least during the reference week) declare themselves as authors; those devoting more time and effort to other occupations declare themselves as members of those occupations.⁸ However, if authors moonlight, then the time spent working, the earnings, and other attributes of labor market behavior are overstated for the author profession. (It would also be true that the work effort and earnings of waiters English teachers are overstated if many of them write in their spare time and are compensated for it.)

This example would be irrelevant if multiple job-holding did not occur in the author profession. It would be less relevant if the incidence of multiple job-holding were the same across all occupational categories. However, the evidence suggests that multiple job-holding is common among authors and several other artist occupations to a greater extent than in most non-artist occupations.

In the next chapter we survey the evidence on employment and earnings of authors from studies based on direct surveys. Some of these surveys inquire about time spent, and money earned, in all occupations during the survey period. These survey-based studies of authors, and of artists in general, consistently report that a significant percentage of authors (artists) moonlight, and that a significant percentage of moonlighting authors' (artists') work time and earnings are from jobs outside the author (artistic) profession. In defense of the Census methodology, we observe that these direct surveys of authors (and other artists) elicit

⁸This description may not be entirely accurate. Our research based on a survey of artists indicates that, although the probability of declaring artist to be one's "principal profession" is positively correlated with work time and earnings from the artistic profession, many persons with little or no earnings from their art nevertheless consider themselves to be artists. See Wassall and Alper (1985).

responses from persons who may devote only a small fraction of their work time to writing (creating or performing their art). Many persons who are enumerated in these surveys would appear in the Census Public Use Sample as members of other occupations, and most social scientists would argue rightly so.

To summarize: The Census classification system will make authors, and several other types of artists, appear to be more successful *in their chosen occupation* than they actually are. Despite this, it reports their *overall* labor market activities accurately.

Authors in the Census: Whom Does the Census Define as an Author?

Since the Census procedure permits individuals to describe their occupations, every type of author or writer may be found in the Census PUMS. However, not every author or writer is found in the authors occupational category. All occupations which were included in the authors category between 1970 and 1990 are shown in Table 2-1. This category includes all writers of fiction, and many other types of writer as well. Because the Census does not publish a breakdown of the numbers of persons in each occupation within an occupational category, we cannot report on the relative distribution of persons across these occupations.

Writers are found in other Census occupational categories as well. For example, a sampling of occupations within the editors and reporters category reveals (in 1990) advertising copy writer, columnist, art critic, book critic, copy writer, editorial writer, feature writer, literary writer, news writer, and sports writer. Similarly, the technical writers category contains writers in the fields of engineering, health, and science, and specialists in documentation and technical writing. Technical writers became an occupational category in 1980; prior to 1980, they were included in the artists, performers, and related workers n.e.c. category. In 1990, the latter category contained among its unique potpourri of occupations a

few at the very fringes of the writing profession, such as crossword puzzle maker and language translator. To conclude, one might argue that the author occupational category, if viewed as encompassing all "creative" writing, could be construed as too broad. On the other hand, if it is viewed as encompassing all those who earn their living from writing, it could be construed as too narrow.

Among the artist occupational categories, the composition of authors has changed the least since 1950.⁹ In 1990, three new occupations were added which previously had been enumerated in the editors and reporters category. These changes are shown in Table 2-1. In the discussion below, we use the term "author" to refer to those enumerated in this Census category. Often in this chapter we compare authors to editors and reporters and to technical writers who, as we have seen, are closely related.

For better or worse, the Census methodology precludes any effort to separate authors who devote all their work efforts to writing from those who combine writing with other work. Other employment issues are addressable through the Census, however. The primary one is whom to include in the universe of authors or, in the jargon of economists, who belongs in the author labor force. This issue is more complex than it might initially appear.

Any study of persons in the labor force must naturally define exactly who is to be included. Most studies use the *civilian labor force* as their baseline definition. Economists define the term *labor force* as encompassing all persons of age 16 and over who are currently working (the *employed*) plus those not working but looking for work (the *unemployed*). In this taxonomy, persons currently not working and not looking for work are described as *out of the*

⁹Citro and Gaquin (1987) report no changes in this category since 1950. By comparison, they note changes of varying degrees in the compositions of the other ten artist categories. Authors have appeared as a separate occupational category in the Census since 1940.

labor force.¹⁰ Obviously excluded as well from the civilian labor force are working persons in the military.

A variant of this definition -- the *experienced civilian labor force* -- has been used in recent artist studies commissioned by the NEA. Like the civilian labor force, the experienced civilian labor force includes all persons not in the military who are working. Unlike the civilian labor force, it includes only those unemployed persons *who have had recent prior work experience*. Thus the experienced civilian labor force is more narrowly defined than the civilian labor force.¹¹ It is also much less frequently used.

There are obvious advantages to presenting and discussing information only on authors who are members of the experienced civilian labor force. The concept of the civilian labor force is widely accepted and used in labor market analysis. The information we discuss below obviously would be comparable to that in prior NEA studies of artists. Indeed, in the sections immediately following, we examine the size and geographic and industrial distribution of authors in the experienced civilian labor force.

However, there are also compelling arguments in favor of analyzing the labor market experiences of authors, and artists in general, using a more expansive definition of the work force. Compared to members of most other professional occupations, artists are more often marginalized in the labor market. As discussed earlier, they often moonlight to make ends meet. In addition, career paths in the arts are rarely well defined. Young persons with artistic

¹⁰Most persons out of the labor force have that status by choice. Some, however, would work if offered a job but have given up looking for work. These persons are termed *discouraged workers*. Because they are not actively looking for work they are not counted as part of the labor force.

¹¹In practice, the two definitions are virtually equivalent. In 1990, the entire civilian labor force included 123,473,450 persons. Of these, only 429,000, or 0.35 percent, were unemployed with no prior work experience. There is often no difference between the two definitions with respect to the occupations examined in this chapter.

skills and training often find it hard to start an artistic career, either in terms of obtaining employment or in finding buyers for their work. Such artists would be excluded from the experienced civilian labor force, since they would be classified as being unemployed with no prior work experience, or out of the labor force. Other artists may be working on their art but unable to sell it while being supported by a spouse or by other relatives or friends. It is not as obvious how they would describe themselves in the Census questionnaire, but they may also wind up classified as out of the labor force.

Clearly these examples have relevance to the author profession. There are numerous anecdotal examples of struggling writers whose status would officially place them either out of the labor force or as members of other occupations for extended periods in their careers.

Many observers, particularly economists, argue that the situations cited above involve persons who should be not considered part of the artist work force, since they have failed to pass a market test; i.e., they have tried but failed to become employed or to sell their work. The often used analogy is that of young men who engage in playground sports or amateur sports leagues and, despite earning no compensation for their efforts, fantasize careers as professional basketball players. Such persons are not described as "professional basketball players" for the obvious reason that they are not sufficiently talented to be hired by a National Basketball Association franchise, despite their ambition and devotion to their craft.

In light of the considerations weighed above, throughout the rest of this chapter we selectively adopt three alternative definitions of the author work force. In the next three sections we focus on aggregate descriptions of the author profession: its size and growth, and locational and industrial preferences of authors. In these sections we look only at authors (and members of selected reference groups) who are part of the experienced civilian labor

force. In the remainder of the chapter we focus on characteristics of the average or representative author, particularly demographic traits, labor market experience and earnings. We include in these analyses all persons who call themselves authors in the Census PUMS *regardless of labor market status or work experience*. We call this cohort *all Census authors*, and compare them to their counterparts in our reference groups in the Census PUMS, also regardless of labor market status or work experience. The data in Tables 2-9 through 2-29 refer to persons who fit this description.

Looking at all Census authors provides the broadest perspective on the profession, since it includes both those in and out of the labor force at the time the Census was taken. This perspective is particularly suited to studying artists, for the reasons given above. It also is a perspective that many artists themselves have urged social scientists to take. However, we will discover that it makes authors, as well as all artists, appear slightly less successful relative to other professional and technical workers for three reasons: (1) a slightly higher percentage of all Census authors is found in the out of the labor force category; (2) a higher percentage of authors in the experienced civilian labor force is unemployed; and (3) a lower percentage of working authors holds full-time employment. Looking at only those authors in the experienced civilian labor force has a similar effect, since reasons (2) and (3) still apply. Roughly comparable differences also exist between all artists and professional and technical workers. These differences are real, and an integral aspect of working as an author or other artist. If, however, one's objective is to compare authors to members of other occupations *when they share the same job status*, perhaps the best choice is to compare the labor market

experiences of only *full-time, year-round workers*¹² in each profession.

Rather resolving this issue, we provide information on authors and reference occupations for all three labor market situations. The same demographic, labor market and income data found in tables describing authors and other occupational reference groups can be found in the appendix to this chapter, for members of the same occupational groups who were also members of the experienced civilian labor force, and for those who were also full-time year-round workers.¹³ We urge the reader to examine these tables. The differences in outcomes that the choice of work force description makes are discussed throughout.

Size and Growth in the Author Profession

The growth in the author profession over the 1970-90 period was exceptional and erratic. Authors in the experienced civilian labor force grew more rapidly than any other artist occupational class, at an astonishing rate of 285 percent over this period, numbering 106,730 by 1990. This growth rate is driven mainly by recent events. The growth rate between 1970 and 1980 was a far lower 65 percent. Between 1970 and 1985, the growth rate was still a much more ordinary 95 percent; the Current Population Survey reported 54,096 authors in the civilian labor force in 1985 (Citro and Gaquin, 1987, Table B1). Thus the number of authors roughly doubled between 1985 and 1990.

The inclusion of reference groups in Table 2-2 further illustrates how rapidly the author labor force has grown. By comparison, all artists (including authors) grew at less than half the

¹²Full-time year-round workers are defined as those who worked at least 35 hours per week and 50 weeks per year. Full-time year-round status was determined by each person's response to questions about hours and weeks worked. In the 1980 and 1990 Census questionnaires, the hours and weeks worked questions referred to the previous calendar year. In the 1970 Census questionnaire, the hours worked question referred to the reference week (i.e., the Census year), but the weeks worked question referred to the previous calendar year.

¹³Tables 2-9 to 2-11, 2-15 to 2-17, 2-21 to 2-24, and 2-27 to 2-29 refer to all Census authors and their counterparts. In the appendix, Tables 2A-1 through 2A-12 refer to authors and their counterparts in the experienced civilian labor force; Tables 2A-13 through 2A-24 refer to authors and their counterparts who were full-time, year-round.

author growth rate over the same twenty year period. Similarly, all professional workers (including artists) grew at an even slower rate, 89.2 percent, but still more rapidly than the labor force as a whole.¹⁴ The growth in the entire labor force between 1970 and 1990 was just under 54 percent, or less than one-fifth the rate of growth of authors. As a final reference point, the rate of growth of the U. S. population for the same period was 22.4 percent.

The reasons behind the dramatic growth of authors over this period, and especially over the last five years, are unclear. A useful start toward unearthing these reasons is to obtain information, which unfortunately is available only in special Census tabulations, on the numbers persons in the labor force *by occupation* within the author category to determine whether all author occupations expanded equally or if only some led this dramatic upsurge. It is difficult to attribute this growth to purely economic factors. As we will see below, the increase in the earnings of authors, though substantial, has not outstripped that of similar professions throughout the period.

The other point made in these numbers, perhaps more implicitly, is the very small size of the author profession. By 1990, at the end of this period of phenomenal growth, authors constituted 0.09 percent of the labor force (i. e., less than one-tenth of one percent). They also constituted a small share of the artist labor force, 6.4 percent. Among the artist occupational groups, only announcers, dancers, and college and university teachers of art, drama, and music contain fewer members.¹⁵

Where Authors Work: Regional Distribution

In this section, we examine the regional distribution and growth of authors from 1970 to

¹⁴Only in Table 2-2 are professional workers including artists used as a reference group. In other tables the reference group is all professional and technical workers excluding artists.

¹⁵This comparison excludes the artists, performers and related workers not elsewhere classified category.

1990. Table 2-3 shows the regional distribution of authors in the 1970-90 Census years. The nine-region breakdown in this table is commonly used in geographic displays of Census data.

In 1980 and 1990, the Pacific region, dominated by California, contained the most authors. In 1970 this region was second in number of authors to the Mid-Atlantic (which includes New York), which in turn came in second in 1980 and 1990. The Pacific region, however, ranked third in the rate of growth of authors over the twenty year period. Starting from an admittedly smaller base, the Mountain region had the highest rate of growth (515.7 percent), closely followed by the West South Central region (471.5 percent). The region with the slowest growth in authors was the Mid-Atlantic (196.8 percent), closely followed by New England (197.9 percent).

The differential growth rates of authors across the nine regions are generally consistent with overall labor force and population growth for the same period. Also, larger regions naturally tend to be home to more authors. Nevertheless, differences exist between authors and all members of the labor force, both in terms of where they are located and of relative regional growth. These factors can be seen more easily with the use of location quotients. Location quotients are used to show regional concentration, usually of industries or of workers. Here we use a location quotient to show occupational concentration, i.e., the percentage of authors who reside in a region divided by the percentage of the entire labor force which resides in the region. Mathematically, this location quotient may be defined as

$$L = \frac{LF_i^a / LF_{US}^a}{LF_i / LF_{US}} = \frac{LF_i^a / LF_i}{LF_{US}^a / LF_{US}}$$

where the subscripts refer to any region i and to the US respectively, and "a" refers to the author labor force. Thus, for example, a location quotient greater than one will be found in a

region in which a larger percentage of the author labor force resides than of the overall labor force; a location quotient of exactly one implies identical shares of the author and the total labor force in a region. For any occupation, the entire country must have a location quotient of one.

How this plays out among the nine Census regions can be seen more readily in Table 2-3. Over all three Census years, authors have been disproportionately concentrated on each coast. The only region with no land on either coast that has ever had a location quotient greater than one in this period is the Mountain region, in 1990. The two regions with the greatest endowment of authors, relative to the entire labor force, have rather consistently been the Pacific and the Mid-Atlantic. Over this period, there has been a gradual trend toward greater regional equality in where authors live, in the sense that their geographic distribution has become more closely aligned with the distribution of the entire labor force. This is shown by the convergence of the regional location quotients toward one. Most notable in this convergence process is New England, which in 1970 had the highest concentration of authors; its location quotient is now almost identically one. Most landlocked regions have location quotients rising toward one.

More detail on author residence can be seen at the state level. As with regions, we look at both absolute numbers and relative concentrations. Table 2-4 shows the ten states in which the most authors resided in 1990. As it was in 1980, California is the place of residence of more authors than any other state. New York, second in both these years, ranked first in 1970. The sole newcomer to the top ten ranking in 1990 is Washington, which ranked thirteenth in 1980 and eighteenth in 1970. Other states ascending the rankings are Texas, rising from nine to five to three, and Florida, rising from eleven to seven to five. States

dropping in the ranks include Connecticut, which fell from fifth to eleventh to sixteenth, and Maryland, which fell from third to twelfth to eleventh. The top ten states have been home to roughly two-thirds of all authors in the labor force in each Census year, regardless of their identity and ranking.

It is obvious that the most populous states tend to have the most authors. Some of the differentials in author population over this period simply reflect differential growth rates of the states' population. It is no secret that California, Texas, and Florida are both bigger and growing faster than Maryland, Massachusetts and Connecticut. Thus a second, and perhaps more informative, way to look at the distribution of authors among states is to examine their percentages in each state's experienced civilian labor force.¹⁶ This is done in Table 2-5, where the ten states with the highest *percentage* of author to total employment are ranked.

The top ten states in this ranking are an interesting mix. Four -- New York, California, Massachusetts and Washington -- are also ranked among the ten states with the most authors, and are members of three of the four regions with the largest location quotients in 1990. New York and California top both state rankings, and may well be special cases, with their concentrations of radio, television, film, publishing and advertising industries.¹⁷ Many if not all of the ten states in this ranking are high "quality of life" states, the kinds of places that people with no constraints on where they can live would be likely to locate. Prime examples

¹⁶Listing states in descending order of the percentage of authors in their labor force gives the same ranking as does listing states in descending order of author location quotient. Calculation of percentages essentially removes information from each location quotient calculation -- the ratio of US author to US total employment -- which is constant, and thus has no effect on rankings.

¹⁷There may also be some form of cultural agglomeration occurring in our nation's largest metropolitan areas, which may further explain the author's regional distribution. The two metropolitan areas with the highest concentration of *artists* in the labor force are the New York and Los Angeles Consolidated Metropolitan Statistical Areas. These are also the two largest metropolitan areas in the country. Besides having concentrations of the industries that authors work for in these areas, they may attract authors because of their overall cultural environments as well.

are the third and fourth ranked states: Vermont and New Mexico.

The ranking of states with the highest percentage of authors in the labor force is remarkably stable; eight of the top ten in 1990 also appeared in 1980's top ten, and seven of 1990's top ten were in 1970's. Newcomers in 1990's top ten are Washington and Vermont, although Vermont ranked eighth in 1970. Dropouts include Maryland (first in 1970!), Nevada (sixth in 1980) and Hawaii (ninth in 1980).

There is considerable variation in the percentage of authors in each state's labor force. The percentage of authors in the labor force of New York, the state ranked first, is eleven times greater than that of West Virginia, the state ranked last.

For Whom Authors Work: Distribution by Industry

Further insight can be gained into the nature of authors in the Census by examining the distribution of industries in which they work. Industry breakdowns for the three Census years are shown in Tables 2-6 and 2-7. First, in Table 2-6, we split authors in the experienced civilian labor force into ten broad industry groups derived from the Census classification methodology. All workers in the labor force are classified into one of these industry groups.¹⁸ In all three Census years, more authors are found in Professional and Related Services than in any other group. In the last two census years this group held well more than half of all authors. In 1990 only Construction and Manufacturing also contained more than ten percent of the total.

Most industry groups contain a large number of industries. In 1990 the number of industries within each group ranged from 6 in Finance, Insurance and Real Estate to 83 in

¹⁸The number and definition of individual industries have undergone changes from the 1970 to the 1990 Census. However, broad groups of industries, such as those used in Table 2-4, have remained essentially the same. In this table, we aggregate the fourteen Census industry groups into ten.

Construction and Manufacturing. As a consequence, it is more enlightening to examine which industries employ the most authors. In Table 2-7 we show the ten industries which employed the most authors in 1990, and their respective shares of the author labor force for 1990, 1980, and 1970. Miscellaneous Professional Services clearly is where most authors can be found; it employed slightly over half of all authors in 1990, down from almost three-fourths in 1980 but up from about 40 percent in 1970.¹⁹ This industry is single-handedly responsible for the top ranking of Professional and Related Services among industry groups. All other industries held no more than seven percent of author employment in each Census year.

The top ten industries combined employed 80.8 percent of all authors in 1990. The employment pattern in 1980 was similar, except for the even greater prominence of Miscellaneous Personal Services in the ranking. As a consequence, the top ten industries *in 1980* employed 90.0 percent of all authors, and the top ten industries *in 1970* employed 74.0 percent. Of the the top ten industries in 1990, nine were also in the top ten in 1980. However, only four were among the ten largest in 1970. Important sources of author employment in 1970 which subsequently dropped out of the top ten include federal public administration (third), aircraft and parts (fourth), radio, television and communications equipment (fifth), and electrical machinery n.e.c. (tied with colleges and universities for sixth). Theaters and motion pictures, third in both 1980 and 1990, tied for tenth in 1970.

Demographic Characteristics of Authors

In this and the following sections, we now use a more comprehensive definition of the author work force. The information in the tables that follow incorporates everyone who

¹⁹The name of this industry does not provide much insight into what activities it embraces. Persons who indicate writing as their profession but no industry, as well as persons who indicate writing as their industry are placed in this industry category.

identified himself or herself as an author in the Census, regardless of being in the experienced civilian labor force at Census time. Recall that we call this group *all Census authors*. We adopt the same conventions for members of the reference occupational groups. Compared to those enumerated in the sections above, we are now adding the following groups to the experienced civilian labor force of each profession: (1) those who are unemployed with no prior work experience, (2) those claiming an occupation but who are out of the labor force, and (3) those employed by the military.

Before proceeding with our analysis, it is useful to examine how these alternative descriptions of the work force affect the number and nature of the persons that enter into our discussions. In Table 2-8 we see the effects that these different descriptions have on the numbers within each profession. For each Census year, we start with the most inclusive description -- all Census occupation members -- and express other, more narrow work force descriptions as percentages of all Census members. By changing to the more inclusive all Census authors description from the experienced civilian labor force description, we increase the number of authors covered by about 18 percent in 1970, 17 percent in 1980, and by 14 percent in 1990. The effect of the broader definition on the increase in coverage of all artists is very similar. Though a higher percentage of all Census professional and technical workers than authors was also in the experienced civilian labor force in both 1980 and 1990, this difference is small; it lies between one and three percentage points in these years.

Greater differences between occupational groups show up when we examine the percentage of full-time year-round workers in each group. Here it is clear that a gap between other professional and technical workers and authors (as well as all artists) has opened over the twenty year period. In 1970, 43.6 percent of Census authors were full-time, year-round,

compared to 42.7 percent of other professional and technical workers. By 1990, the percentage of full-time authors had fallen to 39.7; the percentage of full-time professional and technical workers had risen to 55.6. The specific reference groups that we use -- editors and reporters and technical writers -- typically show even greater percentages of full-time workers in each Census year. (Recall that technical writers did not become a separate occupational group until the 1980 Census.)

Several other inferences may be drawn from the data in Table 2-8. It is worth noting that the percentage of all Census members in the experienced civilian labor force in any of the occupational groups in this table has risen steadily since the 1970 Census. The percentage of all Census members who worked full-time, year-round has also risen steadily for all occupational groups in this table, except authors. These statistics, plus other indicators discussed later, corroborate the much-discussed phenomenon of Americans working increasingly more hours. The data in Table 2-8 also show how little difference it makes to use the experienced civilian labor force rather than the civilian labor force as the baseline group. Only in 1990 did the counts between the two cohorts differ. Also, only in 1990 were any members of the armed services identified as members of artist professions.

How these different work force definitions affect the nature of the persons in each group will be explored as we examine their demographic and labor market characteristics below. It is logical to expect that, as we move from broad to narrow definitions of the work force, the usual measures of labor market success will become increasingly more positive.

Basic demographic characteristics of all Census authors in 1970, 1980 and 1990 are shown in Tables 2-9 through 2-14. For each Census year, data are presented in two tables. One set of tables shows detailed characteristics of all authors, and then of selected reference

groups: all artists (including authors), all professional and technical workers other than artists, and the two closely related job categories: editors and reporters and technical writers. The other set reproduces the same characteristics of all authors, and then of male, female, white, black and Hispanic authors.²⁰ For greater ease in making comparisons, Tables 2-9 through 2-11 present the same comparative occupational information over the 1970 to 1990 period, and Tables 2-12 through 2-14 present the same information on authors broken into gender, race and ethnicity for the three Census years. This general format continues throughout the rest of this chapter.

In 1990, the average Census author was 44 years old, and had completed just under 16 years of education. In 1990, detailed information on highest degree earned was collected by the Census for the first time.²¹ Thus it is not surprising to discover, since the 16 years of education reported for the average author is roughly equivalent to completing a bachelor's degree, that 43 percent of all authors held this degree. An additional 21 percent had master's degrees. Of the authors in the 1990 Census, 57 percent were married and heads of their households, 50 percent were women, 95 percent were white, 3 percent were black, and one percent was Hispanic.

Most demographic trends found in the overall population and labor force have parallels in the author labor force during the 1970 to 1990 period. The U. S. labor force has become better educated, more ethnically diverse, and comprised of a higher percentage of women.

²⁰Census data on race and ethnicity permit a more detailed breakdown than white, black and Hispanic, but sample sizes in the authors occupational group limited more disaggregated analysis. The Hispanic question in the 1970 Census was worded differently than in 1980 and 1990; thus the numbers of Hispanics and the information reported about them may not be fully comparable between 1970 and subsequent years. Hispanics include persons of Spanish background regardless of race.

²¹Also, in 1990 the Census stopped reporting the highest grade level attained. An algorithm exists to impute 1990 grade levels using highest degree data, which we used. For more detail on this procedure, see Kominski and Siegel (1993).

These trends can also be observed among authors over the same period, with differences allowed for the unique requirements and characteristics of that occupation. Besides those just noted, general demographic trends observed in all the occupational groups profiled in Tables 2-7 to 2-9 include lower rates of marriage and household formation and, for obvious reasons, a decline in the percentage of veterans.

The conventional wisdom in the United States would probably regard authors as being very similar to other artists. It would also regard artists as stereotypically liberal, and perhaps even radical in terms of their lifestyles. However, artists do not possess many of the characteristics expected of such a profession. In reality, artists are more likely to be men and more likely to be white than are other professional and technical workers. Although the rates of marriage and household formation of artists are lower than those of other professional and technical workers, this may be due in part to artists being younger on average. Other professional and technical workers clearly are better educated than artists, possessing from one to one and a half years more formal education over the period. These data show that other professional and technical workers are more likely to possess every type of bachelor's or higher college degree than artists.

Authors' demographics differ in many ways from those of artists. With respect to educational attainment, authors more closely resemble other professional and technical workers. Over the 1970-1990 period, authors' educational attainment closely matched that of other professional and technical workers, but exceeded that of all artists by about one and a half years. In 1990 authors held more of every type of college degree than all artists, and held more bachelor's, masters' and doctor's degrees than other professional and technical workers. Like other professional and technical workers, authors have consistently had higher

rates of marriage and heading households than artists. Again, the age differential between authors and all artists (authors being older by four to seven years) may contribute to these differences. This age differential -- authors are the oldest of any artist occupational category - reflects both later entry and greater longevity in the occupation.²² That the age differential between authors and both artists and professional and technical workers narrowed somewhat in 1990 is probably due to the enormous growth in the author profession; typically, new entrants to a profession are younger than the average member.

In other respects, authors are different from both artists and other professional and technical workers. As noted, authors in every period are older than both groups. Persons with work-affecting disabilities²³ consistently form a higher percentage of the author labor force than of the other groups. The higher proportions of disabled workers in the author work force is consistent with the relatively minimal physical demands required by writing. The typical author is more likely to be a woman than is the typical artist, but less likely to be a woman than the typical professional/technical worker. The typical author is less likely to be a member of a racial minority or to be a Hispanic than either the typical artist or other professional/technical worker. Thus there is no numerical evidence in the Census of the increasing popularity of African-American and Hispanic writers that has occurred in the United States in the 1980s and 1990s; the percentage of these two groups in the author labor force actually declined between 1980 and 1990.

²²By comparison, many performing arts occupations have early entry and short careers. For example, in 1990 40 percent of dancers and 5 percent of authors were younger than 24; 2 percent of dancers and 22 percent of authors were older than 55. Compared to authors, only architects had a lower percentage of its profession in the under 24 category; no other artistic profession had a higher percentage in the over 55 category.

²³In the Census, there are several questions about disability status. The percent disabled appearing in Tables 2-9 through 2-14 describes those who report a disability that either limits or prevents work.

The two occupational groups that also contain writers -- editors and reporters and technical writers -- appear similar to authors. The average age in both has been consistently younger, but educational attainment is similar. Some race and gender differences exist. Compared to authors, in each Census year editors and reporters have had a higher percentage of women and technical writers have had a lower percentage of women; both reference groups have had a higher percentage of racial and ethnic minorities in their ranks in every Census year.

Data on authors who are also members of the *experienced civilian labor force* show essentially the same picture (Appendix Tables 2A-1 to 2A-3). In shifting focus from all Census authors to authors in the experienced civilian labor force, 14 to 18 percent drop out of the sample, depending on the Census year: those who were out of the labor force in the reference week, and those who were unemployed with no prior work experience. The systematic differences that exist between the two samples are reflective of differences in traits that often predict or reflect labor market success. For example, authors in the civilian labor force are younger, better educated, more likely to be married and heads of households, and less likely to be women. In 1970 and 1980 they were more likely to be white; in 1990, the percent white and black were essentially the same between the two groups. Comparable differences exist between all Census artists and artists in the civilian labor force. Most of these same differences apply to professional and technical workers as well.

Authors who work *full-time year-round* (Appendix Tables 2A-13 to 2A-15) are a much smaller group. In 1990, they constituted 39.7 percent of all Census authors and 46.4 percent of authors in the experienced civilian labor force. The percentage of Census authors who were full-time in 1990 is relatively low. By comparison, 58.6 percent of all Census editors and

reporters were full-time, and 64.8 percent of all Census technical writers were full-time. Full-time authors also differ from the broader labor force author classifications. One example is that full-time authors had 16.5 years of education in 1990, 0.3 years greater than those in the experienced civilian labor force and 0.7 years more than all Census authors. Another example: 41 percent of full-time authors were women, as opposed to 50 percent of all Census authors. Somewhat at odds with the above statistics is the fact that a larger percentage of full-time authors belonged to racial and ethnic minorities. Again, roughly comparable differences are found between full-time and broader categories of artists and professional and workers technical (including editors and reporters and technical writers). Full-time members of both these groups were better educated and more likely to be men. However, the percentages of racial and ethnic minorities among full-time members of these occupational groups were equally likely to be greater as less than those in the broader work force categories.

The demographic characteristics of authors over the 1970-90 period, broken into *gender, race, and ethnicity* are shown in Tables 2-12 to 2-14. A number of commonly observed differences in the labor force among race and gender can be seen in the author work force as well. Over all three Census years, white authors were older and had completed more formal education than minority authors. Comparing men and women authors, the evidence is more mixed; in 1980 and 1990, men were older and possessed more formal education; in 1970, the reverse was true. In 1990, the additional detail on degrees earned shows that a higher percentage of women writers possessed bachelor's and master's degrees, but that a higher percentage of men writers possessed professional and doctoral degrees. In general, a higher percentage of white writers possessed bachelor's and higher degrees than

minority writers; the sole exception was Hispanic writers, who had the highest percentage of professional degrees.

Authors in the Labor Market

A great deal of the information reported in the Census PUMS pertains to the labor market experiences of individuals. Some of this information has already been discussed, such as percentages of various occupational groups in the labor force and working full-time all year around. In this section we examine a variety of additional characteristics relating to the labor market status of authors and their reference groups. In tables 2-15 to 2-17, information on authors versus the selected reference groups in 1970, 1980 and 1990 is presented. In Tables 2-18 to 2-20 we focus on the same characteristics over the twenty year period for authors only but disaggregated by gender, race and ethnicity. As before, comparable tables for authors and the reference occupational groups who were members of the civilian labor force and were full-time year-round workers are found in the appendix to this chapter.

In examining the information in these tables, it is important to keep in mind several points relating to how this information was collected. First, questions on labor market experiences may refer to the Census year or to the prior year. Information on labor market status, including whether employed or not and the nature of the employer, are based on the reported activity in which the respondent was engaged in during the reference week. Other statistics provided in these tables, such as full-time, year-round status and average hours and weeks worked, refer to work experience in the prior year,²⁴ since these statistics are based on a calendar year's labor market experience. Also, recall our earlier discussion on multiple job-holding. For persons such as authors (and for many other artists) for whom multiple job-

²⁴Recall that in 1970, only weeks worked referred to the prior year; hours referred to the Census year.

holding is common, the labor market data, especially the annual data, that we discuss below is likely to reflect time spent and experience in non-author (or non-artist) jobs as well.

A labor market snapshot of authors in 1990 shows an occupational group of whom 2.7 percent experienced unemployment during the reference week, and of whom 14.1 percent were neither working nor unemployed. Over the three Census years, authors had consistently lower rates of unemployment than all artists but had consistently higher rates of unemployment than other professional and technical workers. Author unemployment was at least 1.5 times greater than the average of other professional and technical workers in these years. However, author unemployment rates over the twenty year period were roughly comparable to those in the other writing professions: editors and reporters and technical writers. In 1990, authors had lower unemployment rates than either of those two occupational groups.²⁵ Since 1980, authors have been more likely to be found out of the labor force than either of these groups, and than other professional and technical workers in general.

The data in Tables 2-15 to 2-17 also clearly show that *artists* as a group consistently fare less well in the labor market than all other professional and technical workers. A variety of reasons contribute to this finding, which is consistently reflected in Census data from 1940 to 1990: professional qualifications and career paths are less well defined, there are few entry barriers to artist professions such as licensing or degree requirements, and artists are more often self-employed or need to change employers more frequently than members of other professional occupations. The differences in labor market characteristics are reflected in a variety of ways; perhaps the most striking is unemployment rates. In all three Census years the unemployment rate of artists was between two and three times that of other professional

²⁵Unemployment rates for the years between Censuses can be calculated from the Current Population Survey. Because sample sizes are much smaller, however, they are not reliable for small occupational groups such as authors.

and technical workers. In all three years as well, a higher percentage of all Census artists were neither working nor unemployed, i.e., in the not in the labor force category. Another aspect of the poorer labor market outcomes of artists is that they consistently report fewer hours worked per week and fewer weeks worked per year²⁶ than did other professional and technical workers.²⁷

The Census has not generally shed much light on the frequency or duration of employment.²⁸ Some insight on patterns of unemployment can be gained by comparing, in any Census year, the percentage who worked at any time in the Census year (up to the time of the survey) to the percentage who worked during the reference week. In 1990, for example, roughly the same percentage of authors as other professional and technical workers -- 88.4 vs 89.1 percent -- worked at some time during the Census year. A greater difference exists in the percentage actually working during the reference week: 83.2 percent of authors worked during the reference week vs. 86.2 percent of other professional and technical workers. From this one concludes that relatively more authors drift in and out of employment in a given year than other professionals. In 1970 and 1980 comparable distinctions occurred as well: the difference between percent working at all in the year and the percent working at the time of the survey is always greater for authors.

As noted, authors experienced less unemployment than all artists combined. In both

²⁶This statement refers to mean values. In the tables, both means and medians are shown. Means are generally less than medians because of the large number of observations at or near zero.

²⁷In 1980 and 1990, respondents were asked to report the number of hours per week and weeks per year worked in the previous year. In 1970, respondents were asked to choose from a menu the appropriate intervals within which their hours and weeks worked were located. We then assigned to each interval its midpoint value to calculate means and medians. Because of the differences in reporting, the means and medians calculated for 1970 are not entirely comparable to those calculated for 1980 and 1990.

²⁸In 1980 only the Census long form requested the number of weeks unemployed in the prior year; the question was not repeated.

1980 and 1990, however, they worked fewer weeks and fewer hours per year, and fewer authors worked full-time year-round. These phenomena are probably linked to the much higher rates of self-employment in the author profession. Author self-employment rates have not been stable; they rose from 44 to 73 percent in 1980, then fell to 58 percent in 1990. Nevertheless, they are consistently higher than those of artists as a whole, and much higher than those of other professionals. Being self-employed means that one can, for example, report working five hours in a week and not be counted as unemployed. Those who work for employers are rarely retained if they are needed for such small intervals; transactions costs are simply too great to warrant it. Thus those who work for employers, all else equal, are more likely to find themselves unemployed during periods of slack demand. On the other hand, when employed, they have less flexibility regarding the number of hours they work and are more likely to work a traditional 40 hour week.

Since authors are more likely to be self-employed than other professional and technical workers, the logic in the above paragraph predicts that authors should have lower unemployment rates than this group as well. As noted, they do not. The answers to why other professional and technical workers continually experience less unemployment than authors must lie elsewhere. We explain the difference in unemployment by recalling our comments about the unique characteristics of the artist's work experience, which are to a great degree shared by authors: few or no entry barriers, less stability in existing jobs, frequent new jobs and assignments, changes in jobs, and extended periods of no work.

We have already seen that authors, compared to most other artistic and non-artistic professionals, are more likely to be self-employed. Among all Census authors in 1990, besides the 58 percent who reported self-employment, 8 percent reported working for

government, and 32 percent reported working for employers in the private sector. The 32 percent employed in the private sector can be further broken into 26 percent at for-profit organizations and 7 percent at non-profit organizations.²⁹ Besides having high rates of self-employment, authors differ from other professional and technical workers in that the percentage of authors employed by government is low. Editors and reporters and technical workers also have low percentages of government employment, but have low percentages of self-employment as well.

The same labor market characteristics of members of the experienced civilian labor force and of full-time, year-round workers, are found in Appendix tables 2A-4 to 2A-6 and 2A-16 to 2A-18. As we examine these statistics we naturally find numbers which reflect more successful labor market outcomes. Some of the differences that we observe in these outcomes are caused by differences in the work group definitions. For example, members of the experienced civilian labor force by definition one can only be working or unemployed; they cannot be out of the labor force. Thus the percentage of experienced civilian labor force authors who worked during the Census year is higher than that of all Census authors. Also, the employment *and* unemployment rates of authors in the experienced civilian labor force are higher. This reflects differences in group definitions as well; all employed and unemployed authors in the Census are members of both groups, but there are *only* employed and unemployed persons among the authors in the experienced civilian labor force. These distinctions apply to all occupational groups.

²⁹Self-employed workers include those in both incorporated and unincorporated businesses. Only in the 1990 Census was a distinction made between for-profit and non-profit private employers. In all three years government employment was broken into federal, state and local. These are not reported because of the overall low rates of public employment of authors. In addition, in all three years there was an additional category which we do not report: unpaid family worker. Thus the percentage distribution of workers by type of employment in these tables never quite sums to 100.

Someone who was employed or unemployed during the reference week of a Census year was not necessarily unemployed or out of the labor force in the prior year, from which information on hours and weeks worked is derived. Similarly, someone who reported working in the prior year may not have been working in the reference week of the Census year. Nevertheless, annual labor force outcomes are positively correlated; for example, a person who experiences no unemployment in one year is very likely to experience no unemployment in subsequent years. This can be seen in the data on prior year labor market experiences in Appendix Tables 2A-4 to 2A-6. These tables show that authors in the experienced civilian labor force were more likely to have worked any time in the year prior to the Census, and worked, on average, more hours per week and weeks per year than all Census authors.

The relative relationships between authors and members of the reference group occupations remain essentially the same for those of each group in the *experienced civilian labor force*. For example, professional and technical workers in both categories work more hours and weeks than authors, and the differences in time worked between the two groups are essentially the same for both categories.

In comparing all Census authors to *full-time year-round* authors (Tables 2A-16 to 2A-18), we again see that many of the differences between the two groups derive from the manner in which each group is defined. For example, the rates of unemployment and of absence from the labor force in the Census year are naturally lower among persons who worked full-time for the entire previous year.³⁰ Similarly, hours and weeks worked are greater for full-time workers, since a minimum number of hours and weeks worked define a full-time

³⁰In 1970 (Appendix Table 2A-16) the percentages unemployed and out of the labor force automatically became zero, since, for that year only, hours worked referred to time worked during the reference week. Thus a full-time worker by definition had to be employed during the reference week.

year-round worker. However, full-time authors were less likely to be self-employed (46.1 percent vs. 58.0 percent for all Census authors in 1990); virtually all this difference was offset by higher rates of employment for authors in the private sector.

Limiting the sample to full-time year-round workers compresses some differences in outcomes across occupations. For example, although all Census authors worked fewer hours and weeks than their professional and technical counterparts, full-time authors and full-time professionals show minimal differences in time spent working. For other data, the relative relationships between authors and their reference occupational groups resemble those for all Census workers. For example, regardless of which group of workers we examine, we consistently see authors having less unemployment than artists and editors and reporters, and more unemployment than all professional and technical workers.

From decade to decade there is much consistency overall in the questions asked on the Census form. Occasionally, some are asked once and not repeated. An interesting example of this consists of a series of questions on the 1970 form, inquiring into the nature and type of job held five years ago, in 1965. We reproduce the response to one of these questions in Table 2-15; namely, whether or not the person worked in the same occupation five years ago. Of all authors in the 1970 Census, 43.5 percent worked as authors in 1965. Although this percentage may at first blush seem low, it compares closely to the 43.2 of percent other professional and technical workers and 44.7 percent of all artists who had the same occupation in 1965. Not surprisingly, when a more successful sample of members of an occupation is surveyed, we find more commitment to the occupation. Of authors in the 1970 experienced civilian labor force, 44.7 percent were authors five years ago; of full-time year-round authors in 1970, 50.4 percent were authors five years ago.

The comparisons among authors by *gender, race and ethnicity* (Tables 2-18 to 2-20) generally reflect differences found in the labor force as a whole. Men were more likely to be employed than women, and less likely to be out of the labor force. In 1970 and 1980, but not in 1990, men were also less likely to be unemployed. Patterns of employment and unemployment by race and ethnicity are more mixed. A significantly higher percentage of men worked full-time in all three years (e.g., 57.6 percent versus 49.4 percent for women in 1990); however, in 1980 and 1990 both black and Hispanic authors were more likely to be full-time than white authors. In both 1980 and 1990, the percentages of blacks and Hispanic authors working for any level of government are two to three times those of whites. Most of this differential is made up by lower rates of self-employment among minority authors. This pattern may reflect higher rates of part-time writing among minority authors, as it is hard to imagine many full-time jobs in government as authors. This choice, in turn, may reflect greater difficulties among minorities in "making it" as full-time independent writers.

Earnings of Authors

In this section we examine how authors have fared economically over the 1970-1990 period. We report on earnings and other sources of income to authors, and compare them to earnings of our reference occupations. We use the term *earnings* to refer to income from work effort; earnings may be in the form of wages and salaries or earnings from self-employment. An important characteristic of Census data on earnings, noted above, is that they are attributed to one occupation: that which the respondent identifies as the "chief job activity or business last week" according to the instructions which accompany the Census form. Thus it is impossible, using this information, to distinguish earnings of authors received from writing from earnings received in other lines of work. Surveys of authors, discussed in

Chapter 3, consistently report that a low percentage of total earnings is derived from writing.

On the other hand, the information on incomes of persons in the Census is in other respects very detailed, broken into seven categories.³¹ In addition to the seven categories of personal income, household income is also reported. In the tables below, we initially focus on earnings. The Census provides separate categories for wages and salaries and self-employment earnings. The latter category is further broken into non-farm and farm components. We report only the non-farm component in self-employment earnings. For authors (and the other occupational categories which we discuss as well!), farm earnings are minimal, and clearly cannot be from writing. Nevertheless, for the sake of completeness, when we report total earnings we include *all* wage, salary, and self-employment earnings, including farm.³²

Successful authors may command earnings not only from writing, but may receive royalties from published work. There is no separate category in the Census questionnaire for royalties. Instead, they are part of a broader category that we call asset income; this category also includes interest, dividend and net rental income.³³ Asset income can only serve as a rough measure of the actual royalty income received by authors. By comparison, there should be little or no royalty income earned by non-authors. Thus, all else equal, we expect authors to receive greater amounts of asset income.³⁴

³¹There were only six categories of income in the 1970 Census.

³²Because of this practice, total earnings reported in the tables may slightly exceed the sum of the wage and salary and self-employment earnings reported above it.

³³In addition to those enumerated above, it also includes net income from boarders and lodgers, and payments from estate or trust funds. In 1970, when there was one less income category, it also included pensions other than social security, veterans payments, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, alimony and child support.

³⁴One can only speculate where other types of earnings authors occasionally receive, from fellowships and readings, for example, would be classified; perhaps with other self-employment earnings.

We also calculate and report a "wage rate," defined as total earnings from work divided by total hours worked. In the section which follows we discuss measures of and reasons behind earnings variability, and report on the percentage of each occupational group whose income places them below the federal poverty line. In the next section, we report on the total personal incomes and total household incomes of authors and their reference groups. In the last section, we consider a statistical analysis of why authors' earnings are different from those of other artists.

Several of the income entries from the 1970 and 1980 Census that are reported in the tables below were calculated by us. One of these calculations -- that of total earnings -- was done out of necessity, because it was not a separate category in the Census in those years. Two other calculations -- of total personal income and total household income -- were made despite their being reported separately in the Census. These were done to minimize the adverse effects of the Census practice of capping income categories. To preserve anonymity, in all three years the Census declared and reported maximum amounts in every income category. For example, in 1970, the maximum reported amount in every income category was \$50,000; in 1980 it was \$75,000. Persons who earned more than that amount were simply assigned the maximum value. By calculating total earnings, total personal income and total household income as the sums of their respective components we are able to avoid some of the underestimation of means and standard deviations that results from the capping procedure.³⁵ In 1990, the Census capped each income category at different levels; these levels were determined by the earnings distribution in each category. For example, total

³⁵Thus, for example, in 1980 we estimated total personal income as the sum of the amounts in each of the seven categories. In theory it was possible that total personal income estimated this way could range as high as \$525,000. Reported total personal income in the Census was capped at \$75,000 regardless of the amounts in each individual category.

personal income was capped at \$284,000, but asset income was capped at \$40,000.³⁶ In 1990, total earnings were reported by the Census. Thus all income data in 1990 are reported and not calculated.

In Tables 2-21 to 2-23 we compare the earnings and incomes of all Census authors to those of all Census artists and other professional and technical workers over the 1970-1990 period. The actual years in which earnings and incomes were recorded is the year prior to the Census, since all earnings and income data are annual averages. Henceforth, in reporting earnings information, we refer to the year prior to the Census year.

In Tables 2-21 to 2-23, and in Tables 2-24 to 2-26 which report on earnings and income by gender, race, and ethnicity, mean (average) values are reported first. Median values are also reported, in parentheses, below the mean values. In reporting earnings and income data, it is customary to report medians because earnings distributions tend to be skewed upward, resulting in mean earnings being strongly influenced by a few large observations, and usually exceeding median earnings. Income from property tends to be even more skewed upward. Nevertheless, we choose to discuss means rather than medians because many of the categories we report on have more than half the sample reporting zero earnings or income. In such cases, the mean provides more useful information than the median, which is zero. A comparison of means and medians is helpful in interpreting some of the differences in earnings we find among occupations. As one example, the ratio of the mean to the median is later used as a measure of earnings variability.

In 1989, the average total earnings of all Census authors were \$23,335. These

³⁶In addition to these examples, for the other income categories that we report on: wage/salary income was capped at \$140,000, self-employment income was capped at \$90,000, and total earnings were capped at \$284,000. Also, those persons with income at or above any category's maximum were assigned the median value of the incomes of persons above the cap in that state.

earnings were about \$2,100 more than the average earnings of all artists, but almost \$4,800 less than the average earnings of all other professional and technical workers. Editors and reporters and technical writers also earned more than authors, by \$1,600 and \$4,700 respectively. A higher percentage of authors' earnings was derived from self-employment than from the other occupational groups in the tables. This is consistent with the higher reported rates of self-employment in the author occupation.

Comparisons among occupational groups of 1989 earnings with those in 1979 and 1969 reveal some regularities. Only in 1969 did authors earn more than other professional and technical workers, and more than editors and reporters; since 1969 they have earned less than members of these occupations. Since 1979, the first year for which we have this information, technical writers have also earned more than authors. By comparison, in all three years all artists' earnings were less than those of other professional and technical workers. In 1969 and 1989, artists' earnings were less than authors' earnings; in 1979, they were only about \$200 greater.³⁷

The mean earnings of authors in 1989 were 127 percent higher than in 1979, when they were \$10,927; they were 175 percent higher than in 1969, when they were \$8,473. This growth in authors' earnings between 1969 and 1989 of 175 percent may be compared to the earnings growth rates in the reference occupations. Over the same period, the growth in earnings was 205 percent for all artists, 226 percent for editors and reporters, and 261 percent for other professional and technical workers. That the growth in authors' earnings over this period was the lowest among the occupational groups we are tracking was solely due to the relatively slow growth in authors' earnings between 1969 and 1979. Between 1979

³⁷Comparisons of median earnings among these groups tell a more dismal story. Authors start with the highest median earnings in 1969, and then have the lowest in both 1979 and 1989.

and 1989, authors' earnings grew faster than those of any of the reference occupational groups.³⁸

These earnings increases may initially seem dramatic; however, most have not even kept pace with rising prices. The extent to which earnings have kept pace with the cost of living can be determined by deflating earnings for changes in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) over this period. Doing this enables us to estimate real earnings in each occupation, as opposed to the nominal, or current dollar, earnings in the tables.³⁹ We find that, in constant 1969 dollars, authors' earnings fell from \$8,743 in 1969 to \$5,524 in 1979, and then rose to \$6,906 in 1989. Put another way, in constant 1969 dollars authors' earnings fell by \$1,567 over the 1969-1989 period.

These numbers are consistent with news stories describing the eroding purchasing power of Americans' earnings in general over the past two decades. Although this outcome is not specific to authors only, because authors' nominal earnings rose more slowly than those of the other reference groups, they suffered the greatest loss in real earnings. By comparison, all artists combined lost \$684, editors and reporters lost \$265, and other

³⁸It is possible that the reason why the growth in authors' earnings ranks last among these occupational groups is the choice of starting point. Were authors' earnings unusually high in 1969 relative to those of other occupations? This hypothesis can be checked by examining Census data on earnings in 1959 and 1949. Comparing authors to all artists, editors and reporters, and all other professional and technical workers, we find that the growth in authors' earnings between 1959 and 1989 also ranks last, with the earnings growth of other professional and technical workers ranking first. Between 1949 and 1989, the growth in author's earnings ranks third, above only that of editors and reporters; again, the earnings growth of other professional and technical workers ranks first.

³⁹Calculating real earnings, involves dividing nominal earnings, reported in the tables, by the CPI in each respective year. Since the CPI only measures relative changes in price levels, we can arbitrarily assign the 1969 CPI a value of 1.000. (Thus nominal and real earnings are equal in that year.) It then rose to 1.978 in 1979, and to 3.379 in 1989. This indexing also makes the numbers easily interpretable. For example, the CPI shows that consumer prices rose by 97.8 percent between 1969 and 1979. For earnings to have kept pace, they must have risen by at least as much in percentage terms. Values of the CPI were obtained from *Economic Report of the President*, (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1994), Table B-59, p. 335.

professional and technical workers *gained* \$527 in real earnings.⁴⁰

Artists represent only a small percentage of the professional and technical work force. If we measured changes in real earnings over the same period for *all* professional and technical workers, including artists, the outcome would have been a small increase in real earnings. Clearly artists, and especially authors, did not fare as well in terms of increased earnings over this period as did most other professions.

Earnings data for authors in the *experienced civilian labor force* (Appendix Tables 2A-7 to 2A-9) tell essentially the same story. In changing the focus from all Census authors to authors in the experienced civilian labor force, we drop from the analysis all persons not working and not unemployed (i.e., out of the labor force); so naturally earnings rise. But since all the occupational groups tracked in these three tables have roughly the same percentages of members out of the labor force, and since those who are dropped typically did not have earnings anyway⁴¹, we find no relative changes. For example, the mean earnings of authors in the experienced civilian labor force in 1989 was \$25,800, or \$2,465 more than the mean earnings of all Census authors.⁴² However, authors' earnings *relative* to those in the other occupations are ranked the same: first in 1969, last in 1979, and lower than all but all artists in 1989. We find a comparable erosion in the real earnings of authors in the experienced civilian labor force, and we find that other professional and technical workers show a small

⁴⁰Breaking the change in real earnings into decade intervals, we see that all occupational groups suffered losses in real earnings between 1969 and 1979, and then made gains between 1979 and 1989. Of the occupational groups we track, only other professional and technical workers made sufficient gains in the second decade to offset losses in the first decade.

⁴¹Recall that although the authors that are dropped were not in the civilian labor force in the Census year, earnings data are from the previous year, when they could have been working and earning income.

⁴²By comparison, the 1989 differentials in earnings of experienced civilian labor force versus their all Census counterparts was \$2,759 for all artists, \$2,599 for editors and reporters, \$2,277 for technical writers, and \$2,991 for other professional and technical workers.

real earnings gain over the period.

The mean earnings of *full-time year-round* workers in every occupation naturally are higher than the mean earnings of each occupation's entire labor force membership. Since full-time workers may be compensated differently, or experience differentially greater degrees of success, one does not necessarily expect that the earnings of full-time workers in different occupations will rank the same, or show the same growth pattern over time, as the earnings of all labor force members in those occupations.⁴³ And, in examining earnings data for full-time year-round workers only, we do observe several differences. First, as expected, the earnings of full-time authors are higher; in 1989, they were \$35,896, or about \$12,500 more than the earnings of all Census authors. As was the case with all Census authors, the earnings of full-time authors ranked first among the reference occupations in 1969 and last in 1979. Unlike the case with all Census authors, the earnings of full-time authors in 1989 were greater not only than those of all artists, but were greater than those of editors and reporters and technical writers.⁴⁴ Thus, in 1989, of the full-time members of the three professions that embrace those who write for a living, those in the author profession were on average the most financially successful.

Another way of interpreting the relative earnings rankings of full-time authors vs. their reference groups is to observe that the nominal growth in authors' earnings over this period did not lag that of the other professional occupations by as much, and exceeded that of all artists combined. Interestingly, the real earnings of full-time authors and full-time members of *all* of the occupational reference groups fell over this period. In real 1970 dollars, authors'

⁴³Also, as we have seen, the percentage of each occupation that works full-time varies significantly.

⁴⁴Comparing *median* earnings, authors ranked first in 1969, last in 1979, and third, above all artists and editors and reporters (but not technical writers) in 1989.

earnings fell by \$1,433, artists' earnings fell by \$1,604, editors and reporters' earnings fell by \$1,121, and the earnings of other professional and technical workers fell by \$525.

The earnings in any profession can be described as the product of two components: earnings per hour and hours worked per year. The hourly wages we report in the income tables are of course constructed; they are not actual wage rates. We divided total earnings by hours worked; workers who reported not working any hours were dropped from the computation.

A comparison of hours and weeks worked and hourly wages across the occupational categories for all Census members shows the following. Despite having less earnings than other professionals in two of the three Census years, and less earnings than artists in one Census year, authors had the highest hourly wage in all three years. The wage gap between authors and members of the reference occupations increases as we move forward in time; in 1989, the author average hourly wage was \$27.28, roughly \$10 more than that of other professional workers. This result derives mainly from, as reported earlier, the number of hours that authors spend working per year being considerably lower than that of other professionals in all three Census years.⁴⁵

In addition, the relatively high mean wages of authors derive from the presence in the Census data of a number of authors who worked relatively few hours per year but were very well compensated for their work.⁴⁶ The effect on mean wages of these individuals can be noted in the following observations. In two of three Census years, the wages of all Census

⁴⁵More precisely, hours worked per week are less in every year, weeks worked per year are less in all but 1969, but hours per year are less in every year.

⁴⁶The mean wage was calculated by weighting individual wages equally. Thus someone who reports working one hour and \$10,000 in earnings is weighted equally with someone who reports working 2,000 hours and \$20,000 in earnings. Persons with high wage rates raise the mean considerably, but do not affect the median.

authors were higher than the wages of experienced civilian labor force authors. Also, in general the wages of all Census or experienced labor force authors were higher than those of full-time year-round authors.⁴⁷

However, if we look instead at *median* wages, which are not affected by extreme values, be they large or small, we see that full-time, year-round authors had the *highest* median wages in all three years of any author cohort. We also see that, in comparing median wages across occupational groups, authors ranked first only in 1969 and ranked fourth, above only all artists, in 1979 and 1989. How authors rank when mean wages are compared versus how they rank when median wages are compared demonstrates how much the high wage-low hours authors influence these outcomes.

A similar but weaker conclusion applies to the mean hourly wages of all artists. The total earnings of all Census artists were also lower than those of other professionals in all three Census years, and in each year they worked fewer hours. However, artist wages exceeded other professional wages only in 1969. The wage deficit between the artists and other professionals is nevertheless narrower than their earnings deficit; however, with respect to authors, the earnings deficit turns into a wage surplus. If median wages are examined, we find that artists ranked last among our occupational groups in all three Census years.

Variability in Authors' Earnings

One characteristic of the earnings of artists that has been noted in Census data (Filer, 1989) and direct survey data (Wassall and Alper, 1992b) is the greater variability in artists' earnings than in other comparable occupations. The issue of earnings variability is explored

⁴⁷The mean wages of full-time, year-round members of the other occupational groups tracked in the tables were often, but not always, lower than the mean wages of all Census or labor force members. Also, differences in mean wages between the two cohorts were smaller.

in Tables 2-27 to 2-29 for *all Census authors* and their reference groups. In these tables we report on two measures of variability: the coefficient of variation⁴⁸ and the ratio of mean to median. We also examine evidence on the presence of persons in each group with zero earnings and high earnings to determine how observations at each end of the earnings spectrum affects earnings variability.

The evidence shows authors having a higher percentage of persons with zero (or negative) earnings in every Census year. In 1989, for example, the percentage of authors with zero earnings was twice as great as that of editors and reporters, technical writers, or other professional and technical workers combined. It has been as high or higher than the percentage of all artists with zero earnings. In every Census year, the percentage of artists with zero earnings exceeded the percentage of persons with zero earnings in the non-artistic professions tracked in these tables. On the other end of the spectrum, the evidence shows that a higher percentage of authors had earnings at the maximum level (the level at which the Census assigns all persons the same value regardless of actual income or earnings) in all three Census years. Also, a higher percentage of authors had asset income (and income from all sources) at the maximum than any other occupational group. All artists combined, on the other hand, tended to rank low or last in the percentage with earnings at the maximum.

The use of statistics such as the coefficient of variation and the ratio of mean to median provides a single index of variability; these statistics can then be compared across occupations. With both, larger values imply greater variability. In all three Census years, authors' earnings have the largest coefficient of variation; all artists' earnings have the second largest. In 1979 and 1989, authors' earnings have the largest ratio of mean to median

⁴⁸The coefficient of variation is defined as the ratio of the standard deviation to the mean.

earnings, with artists second. In 1969, this ranking is reversed, with authors tied for last with other professional and technical workers.

As with the earnings data, we find that an examination of earnings variability data for authors and reference occupational group members in the *experienced civilian labor force* (Appendix Tables 2A-10 to 2A-12) shows the same relative outcomes. Naturally, fewer workers are found with zero earnings and more workers are found at the earnings maximum in each year. Percentage-wise, authors again dominate both the low and high ends of the earnings spectrum. Earnings variability measures tend to be smaller because limiting observations to members of the experienced civilian labor force eliminates many at the low end of the earnings spectrum. Nevertheless, the earnings of authors have the largest coefficient of variation in all three years, and the highest ratio of mean to median in two of three years. Artist earnings variability measures consistently rank second.

With full-time, year-round workers we see a considerable shrinkage in the percentages of persons with zero earnings, higher percentages of persons with earnings at the maximum, and a further reduction in the earnings variability measures. There are minimal changes in the rankings by occupational group. The coefficient of variation of authors' earnings is greater than that for any other occupation in each year. However, the ratio of mean to median authors' earnings places them last in 1969, first in 1979, and third in 1989.⁴⁹

Another statistic that highlights the concentration of persons at the low end of the income spectrum is the percentage of members in an occupation with household or individual

⁴⁹The lower relative values of mean to median for full-time authors underscores the importance of persons with zero earnings in causing authors' earnings variability. In moving to full-time authors, almost all of the persons with zero earnings drop out; virtually all of the high earners remain.

incomes below the poverty line.⁵⁰ The poverty status of all Census authors and members of occupational reference groups is found in Tables 2-21 to 2-23. Income counted toward poverty status is from all sources, including other family members, and thus includes more than earnings. This statistic also measures, as was its original intention, the concentration of poverty in different groups. Here we examine differences in poverty status among occupational groups.

Poverty rates of authors, and of artists in general, are higher than those of editors and reporters, technical writers, and all other professional and technical workers combined. For any occupation, the poverty rates of all Census members will be higher than members of that occupation more narrowly defined. Poverty rates fall as we turn to experienced labor force workers, and fall further when we turn to full-time, year-round workers. What does not change is the relative ranking of occupations within each category. Authors and all artists have the highest incidence of poverty, regardless of the labor force definition employed. This finding is particularly notable given that authors had the highest household incomes of all the occupational groups. It further highlights the adverse effect of authors having the highest concentration of low earners among these groups.

Why do the earnings of artists have greater variability than those in comparable professions, and why are the earnings of authors subject to even more variability? We have addressed this question in part by our earlier discussion of hours worked; artists, and especially authors, work fewer hours in a year and experience greater variability in those hours worked. When one considers the career of an author, and of many types of artist, one

⁵⁰The poverty line is a federally established standard. Its construction is relatively simple. The cost of feeding a family a nutritionally balanced diet is multiplied by three. The poverty line increases with increasing family size, and is adjusted annually for changes in the cost of living.

sees someone who, like many self-employed tradespersons, moves among projects or employers. Compensation may differ greatly from move to move. A best selling book may be followed by one which does not sell. Rarely is there a long-term contractual relationship with a steady employer with compensation rising gradually every year, as there is in many other occupations. (Authors in fact may seek out such relationships in non-author work, such as teaching.)

Alternative explanations exist. One, advanced primarily for performing artists, is that artists are risk-lovers. (Santos, 1976) They view their occupation as a lottery, each person having a small chance of becoming famous and extremely wealthy. Many other occupations, by comparison, which provide more adequate compensation but with no chance of becoming wealthy, attract risk-averse persons. Again, teaching is a good example of such a profession. Another explanation views being an artist as providing satisfaction in itself (what economists call "psychic income"). Persons are willing to accept lower compensation in such an occupation, and persons who are not making it at all, the ones at the low end of the earnings spectrum, linger longer than would persons failing at other occupations. Reality may lie in a mixture of these explanations.

Other Sources of Income

To return to the earnings data for all Census members in Tables 2-21 to 2-23: for *all Census workers*, they show other professional and technical workers (including the two writing occupations other than authors) earning more than authors in every Census year, and authors earning more than all artists in every Census year but 1979. But relationships among these occupational groups with respect to *total personal income* (the sum of all income sources, including earnings) between the two groups show a different pattern. In 1969, authors'

personal income ranked first, as did authors' earnings. In 1979, when authors' earnings were the lowest of the five occupations, authors' personal income ranked third. In 1989, when authors' earnings ranked fourth of the five occupational groups, authors' personal income again ranked third.

The main reason for authors' improved status in the personal income rankings is the greater amounts of asset income they receive. As noted, this category includes royalties, but also includes other sources of income from property. That authors' asset income averages from two to four times as large as that of the other reference groups lends credence to the hypothesis that it is primarily royalties that make this difference.⁵¹ Nevertheless, asset income is not a large component in the compensation of authors; asset income averages about one-fifth of total earnings.⁵² In two of the three Census years, the median asset income was zero, indicating that more than half of all authors received none at all. In the third year (1979), it was \$25.

The total personal incomes of authors in the *experienced civilian labor force* rank the same in each year relative to the reference occupational groups. Naturally, the total personal incomes of members of the experienced civilian labor force are slightly higher than their occupational counterparts in the all Census cohort.

Among *full-time, year-round workers*, authors relative ranking in personal incomes is

⁵¹In Census years other than 1969, authors consistently earned more of other types of income as well. However, the main reason that authors' personal income raises them in this ranking is the greater asset income that they received.

⁵²Making the extreme assumption that royalties constitute 100 percent of asset income, they nevertheless are smaller than the amounts identified in some surveys of authors. For example, Kingston and Cole (1986) find that, in 1979, "royalty payments alone typically accounted for 87 cents of every writing-related dollar" (P. 59). However, their survey was limited to authors who had published at least one book, and they were able to isolate earnings from writing. Median earnings from writing in their survey were reported to be 33 percent of median personal income (p. 100); thus royalty income was 29 percent of personal income among authors in their survey. By comparison, Census data from 1979 show that the average asset income of authors was 19 percent of average personal income.

similar to those noted above. The only difference is that authors' personal incomes placed them first in 1989 as well as in 1969.

The personal incomes of authors, as well as most of the occupational reference groups, did not keep pace with inflation over this period. All Census authors, for example suffered a loss of \$924 in real total personal income between 1969 and 1989. Of the other occupational groups, only other professional and technical workers gained ground, increasing real personal incomes by \$701. Authors in the experienced civilian labor force and full-time year-round authors also lost purchasing power over this period, by roughly the same amount. Among these categories, no occupational group kept with inflation; all suffered real income losses.

One characteristic of the overall income profile of artists that has often shown up in direct surveys of artists might be termed a telescoping effect: although earnings from art work are very low, total earnings from all sources are higher but typically below those of comparably educated persons in other professions, and total household income is closer to or on a par with that of persons in other professions. Using Census data, we see essentially the same phenomenon. Of course with Census data we cannot determine what portion of artists' earnings is from art work. We do, however, see the improvement in financial status as we move from earnings to total personal income to total household income. For example, among the occupational groups in Tables 2-21 through 2-23, authors rank first in total household income in each year. Also, the income gap between all artists and the reference groups in the table is narrower in percentage terms than the earnings gap. Nevertheless, artists' household income places them last in every year.

The primary contributor to household incomes other than the professionals described in the accompanying data clearly is the spouse or partner, when one is present. Why do authors

have spouses who contribute more to household income than do members of other professions? This question cannot be answered definitively here. It is not because a higher percentage authors are women (they are not), which would predict higher earnings from male spouses. Another possibility is the higher educational levels of authors; might they attract better educated spouses with higher earnings? We did not test for this.

Authors in the experienced civilian labor force continue to rank first (and artists last) in total household income. The picture changes only slightly when full-time year-round authors are examined. Their household income places them first in 1969 and 1989, and second in 1979. Full-time artists' household income places them last in all three years. Percentage-wise, the range of household incomes across occupational groups is narrower than the range of earnings, and similar to that of personal incomes.

In examining changes in real household income, the situation is different from prior looks at the effects of inflation on earnings and personal income. The household income increases experienced by all occupational groups kept them ahead of inflations. All Census authors saw real household incomes rise by \$2,370 over the 1969-1989 period; other occupational groups had comparable gains. This general conclusion held true for experienced civilian labor force and full-time year-round counterparts in each occupational group. The basic reason why household incomes but not personal incomes or earnings have kept ahead of inflation is the increasing labor force participation of women over the same period. Families have kept ahead of inflation typically not by seeing their earnings grow at a faster rate but by having more family members in the labor force.

Earnings and Income by Gender, Race and Ethnicity

In Tables 2-24 to 2-26 we summarize information about authors' earnings and income

by gender and race. Men dominated all personal earnings, income and wage categories in all three Census years. Women's annual earnings as a percentage of men's increased from 42.8 percent in 1969 to 47.1 percent in 1979 to 52.5 percent in 1989. Women's calculated hourly wage, measured as a percentage of men's, increased from 58.2 percent in 1969 to 82.0 percent in 1979, but fell dramatically to 40.4 percent in 1989. The wage disparity in 1989 is especially noteworthy. The high hourly wage earners referred to above are mostly men. The men's mean wage in 1989 of \$40 is \$24 higher than the women's, but the men's median wage of \$12 is less than \$4 higher than the women's median.

In absolute dollar terms, differences in total personal between men and women authors are larger than differences in earnings. A major factor contributing to these differences in 1979 and 1989 are the greater amounts of asset income earned by men. However, women authors have greater household incomes in all three Census years. These differences in household income between men and women authors are small, averaging less than \$1,000 over the three Census years. While the household income of men authors is about one-third greater than their personal income, the household income of women authors is about two-thirds greater. Authors in general marry well, but women authors particularly find successful spouses.

There is less overall disparity among earnings of members of different races and ethnic backgrounds. In general, white earnings are higher than those of blacks and Hispanics, but percentage earnings differentials among ethnic groups are narrower than those between the sexes. Also, there are no consistent trends in earnings differences. Black authors earnings fell between 80 and 90 percent of white authors' earnings, with the highest ratio in 1969. Hispanic authors' earnings fell between 64 and 115 percent of white authors' earnings, with

the highest ratio in 1979. Hourly wages show similar small gaps in 1969 and 1979; in 1989, however, the gap between white wages and black and Hispanic wages widened dramatically.

Between men and women authors, we saw the percentage income gap narrow as we moved from earnings to personal income to household income. This pattern is reversed for income differences between whites and minority authors. We typically see larger disparities between the personal incomes and the household incomes of whites versus blacks and Hispanics.

The unusual behavior of the wages of men authors and white authors in 1989 is not easy to rationalize. The calculated wages of these two groups more than doubled between 1979 and 1989, and significantly outpaced the growth in women and all minority wages. There was no comparable explosion in median wages for men and whites; thus the growth in mean wages was driven by the success of a limited number of white men in securing very high hourly compensation for their output. In a similar vein, there was no explosion in the *earnings* of whites and men in 1989; the high mean wages reflect high hourly compensation, not high total compensation.

As discussed above, poverty levels are based on household incomes, and not just earnings. In 1979 and 1989, the poverty rates of men authors were higher than those of women. Similarly, in the same two Census years, the poverty rates of white authors was lower than those of black and Hispanic authors, by wide margins. In 1969, women authors had a higher incidence of poverty than men authors despite having higher household incomes. Also in 1969 white authors had a higher incidence of poverty than black and Hispanic authors despite having higher household incomes.⁵³

⁵³The unusual distribution of poverty incidence among ethnic groups in 1969 may partly attributable to small

Why Do Authors' Earnings Differ from Those of Other Artists: A Statistical Analysis

As we have seen, in 1969 and 1989 authors earnings exceeded those of other artists. Authors' hourly wages exceeded artists' hourly wages in all three Census years. Although one can speculate as to why these differentials exist by using casual observation of known characteristics of authors versus other artists, a more rigorous analysis can be made with the use of earnings functions.⁵⁴ In Table 2-30 we reproduce earnings functions for all artists in the 1970, 1980 and 1990 Census. The methodology is essentially the same as that originally reported, for Census years 1950-1980, in (Wassall and Alper, 1992a). In each of the three functions reported, the dependent variable is the natural log of earnings.

Included among explanatory variables are many of the usual human capital attributes, such as education and experience, and other factors known to affect earnings, such as gender, race, marital status, presence of children, and disability status. In addition, dummy variables for artist occupation and region are included.

As is the case when using (0,1) qualitative variables to detect the influence of components of a group on earnings, the qualitative variable representing one of the component must not be entered in the equation. In these equations, the artist category not accounted for are college and university art teachers. Thus the influence of each occupational variable on earnings is measured with respect to the influence of art teachers. The author variable is negative and significant in all three Census years. This is also true of other occupational groups, except architects. Thus there is little evidence that being an

samples of black and Hispanic authors in that Census.

⁵⁴An earnings function is a regression equation with earnings or, more typically, the natural logarithm of earnings, as the dependent variable. Earnings are regressed on expected causal factors. The most basic of these are the so-called human capital factors, such as education and work experience. For more detail, see Polachek and Seibert (1993).

author per se increases one's earnings above those of other artists.

A better explanation of authors' earnings lies in the importance of the human capital variables. Recall that authors were consistently older and better educated, and were more likely to be white, married and the heads of households. All of these traits are positively correlated with earnings. Although some traits of authors (such as more likely to be a woman and to be self-employed) predict lower earnings, on balance, a human capital interpretation of differences in artists' endowments of human capital would predict higher earnings for authors than for most other artist groups. One might also expect authors to have the strongest verbal and writing skills of any artist occupation; though not measured by the Census, these traits are correlated with job success as well. As we will see in Chapter 3, there is considerable evidence that the majority of the earnings of authors is not from writing. Thus it may be true that authors' verbal abilities enhances their earnings in other occupations more than any general human capital skills possessed by other artists.

TABLE 2-2

NUMBERS OF AUTHORS IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, COMPARED TO (1) ARTISTS, (2) PROFESSIONALS, AND (3) ALL WORKERS, 1970 TO 1990

CATEGORY	1970	1980	1990	GROWTH RATE
Authors	27,752	45,748	106,730	284.6%
Artists	736,960	1,085,693	1,671,278	126.8%
Professionals	8,800,210	12,275,140	16,647,688	89.2%
All Workers	80,051,046	104,057,985	123,044,450	53.7%

Source: Diane C. Ellis and John C. Beresford, *Trends in Artist Occupations, 1970-1990* (Washington: National Endowment for the Arts, 1994).

TABLE 2-3

**NUMBERS AND RELATIVE DISTRIBUTION OF AUTHORS IN THE EXPERIENCED
CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, BY CENSUS REGIONAL DIVISION, 1970-1990**

REGION	NUMBER OF AUTHORS			AUTHOR LOCATION QUOTIENT		
	1970	1980	1990	1970	1980	1990
New England	2,749	3,119	8,190	1.606	1.154	1.026
Mid-Atlantic	7,116	11,968	21,121	1.359	1.154	1.325
East North Central	2,915	4,244	11,152	0.520	0.490	0.608
West North Central	1,609	1,945	5,730	0.720	0.523	0.714
South Atlantic	4,713	6,068	16,804	1.145	0.848	0.898
East South Central	685	654	2,767	0.423	0.239	0.449
West South Central	1,121	2,192	6,407	0.450	0.480	0.578
Mountain	1,054	2,514	6,490	0.976	0.954	1.123
Pacific	5,790	13,044	28,119	1.582	1.994	1.689
TOTAL	27,752	45,748	106,730	1.000	1.000	1.000

DIVISIONAL BREAKDOWN: New England: CT, ME, MA, NH, RI, VT. Mid-Atlantic: NJ, NY, PA. East North Central: IL, IN, MI, OH, WI. West North Central: IA, KN, MN, MO, NE, ND, SD. South Atlantic: DE, DC, FL, GA, MD, NC, SC, VA, WV. East South Central: AL, KY, MS, TN. West South Central: AR, LA, OK, TX. Mountain: AZ, CO, ID, MT, NV, NM, UT, WY. Pacific: AK, CA, HI, OR, WA.

SOURCE: Ellis and Beresford, *Trends in Artist Occupations, 1970-1990* (Washington: National Endowment for the Arts, 1994), Table 5; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Geographic Profile of Employment and Unemployment* (Washington, various years).

TABLE 2-4

THE TEN STATES WITH THE MOST AUTHORS IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN
LABOR FORCE IN 1990

STATE	Amount in 1990	Amount in 1980	Amount in 1970
California	23,251	11,272	5,035
New York	14,804	9,361	5,567
Texas	4,753	1,487	721
Illinois	4,264	1,701	840
Florida	4,116	1,352	708
Virginia	4,056	1,320	914
Massachusetts	4,042	1,525	1,347
Pennsylvania	3,281	1,237	710
New Jersey	3,036	1,370	839
Washington	2,679	852	448
Top Ten in Each Year as % of Total Author Labor Force	64.0%	68.9%	66.4%

SOURCE: Ellis and Beresford, *Trends in Artist Occupations, 1970-1990* (Washington: National Endowment for the Arts, 1994), Table 5.

TABLE 2-5

**THE TEN STATES WITH THE HIGHEST RATIOS OF AUTHORS TO TOTAL
EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE IN 1990**

STATE	Percent in 1990	Percent in 1980	Percent in 1970
New York	0.166%	0.118%	0.075%
California	0.157	0.100	0.063
Vermont	0.139	0.038	0.049
New Mexico	0.131	0.062	0.042
Virginia	0.129	0.054	0.052
Massachusetts	0.125	0.054	0.056
Colorado	0.122	0.062	0.037
Connecticut	0.117	0.056	0.082
Washington	0.111	0.044	0.034
Alaska	0.109	0.067	0.027
U. S. Average	0.087	0.044	0.035
SOURCE: See Table 2-4.			

TABLE 2-6

**PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AUTHORS IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR
FORCE ACROSS INDUSTRY GROUPS, 1970-1990**

INDUSTRY GROUP	1970	1980	1990
Extraction	0.2%	0.1%	0.3%
Construction and Manufacturing	33.5	9.1	12.1
Transportation, Communication and Utilities	3.7	3.1	3.5
Wholesale and Retail Trade	1.0	0.7	1.9
Finance, Insurance and Real Estate	0.9	0.6	1.5
Business and Repair Services	4.8	3.3	5.3
Personal Services	0.7	0.1	0.4
Entertainment and Recreation Services	1.8	3.5	5.3
Professional and Related Services	46.3	77.5	65.9
Public Administration	7.2	2.0	3.9
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from 1970, 1980 and 1990 US Census PUMS.			

TABLE 2-7

THE TEN INDUSTRIES WHICH EMPLOYED THE MOST AUTHORS IN 1990 AND THEIR PERCENTAGE SHARE OF THE AUTHOR EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE

INDUSTRY	% in 1990	% in 1980	% in 1970
Miscellaneous Professional Services	52.2%	72.2%	39.9%
Printing and Publishing, except Newspapers	6.7	4.8	6.5
Theaters and Motion Pictures	4.9	3.4	1.7
Colleges and Universities	4.2	1.5	2.5
Management and Public Relations Services	3.3	*	*
Advertising	2.5	1.2	1.3
Radio and Television Broadcasting	2.2	2.3	2.1
Newspaper Printing and Publishing	1.8	2.0	0.8
Business Services, n.e.c.	1.6	0.9	0.4
Research, Development, and Testing Services	1.4	0.5	**
Top Ten in Each Year as % of Total Author Labor Force	80.8	90.0	74.0
* Included in Miscellaneous Professional Services in 1980 and 1970.			
**Included in Miscellaneous Professional Services in 1970.			
SOURCE: See Table 2-6.			

TABLE 2-8

ALTERNATIVE LABOR FORCE DEFINITIONS AS A PERCENTAGE OF ALL CENSUS
OCCUPATIONAL MEMBERS, 1970 TO 1990

YEAR/LABOR FORCE	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
1990:					
All in Census	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Civilian Labor Force	85.6	84.4	86.8	87.7	89.2
Exper. Civ. Labor Force	85.6	84.4	86.7	87.6	89.2
Full-time Year-round	39.7	46.1	55.6	58.6	64.8
1980:					
All In Census	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Civilian Labor Force	83.4	84.5	86.6	86.6	88.5
Exper. Civ. Labor Force	83.4	84.5	86.6	86.6	88.5
Full-Time Year-Round	34.8	42.8	51.6	51.9	60.9
1970:					
All in Census	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	NA
Civilian Labor Force	82.1	80.6	80.9	81.9	NA
Exper. Civ. Labor Force	82.1	80.6	80.9	81.9	NA
Full-time Year-round	43.6	40.4	42.7	47.8	NA
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from 1970, 1980 and 1990 Census PUMS.					

TABLE 2-9

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS VS. SELECTED
REFERENCE GROUPS, 1970**

ATTRIBUTE	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Age	43.0	39.1	39.6	39.9	NA
Education	14.9	13.6	15.0	14.9	NA
% WHO ARE:					
Married	67.2	66.2	72.1	69.1	NA
Head of Household	68.6	59.3	55.2	63.2	NA
Women	37.3	36.3	47.8	46.9	NA
White	97.3	94.6	93.1	97.0	NA
Black	2.2	3.6	5.4	1.8	NA
Other Race	0.5	1.8	1.5	1.2	NA
Hispanic	1.5	3.0	1.9	1.3	NA
Disabled	8.1	7.9	5.7	5.9	NA
Veteran	37.0	30.9	----	----	NA
Immigrant	5.2	8.8	5.7	5.4	NA
Non-Citizen	2.0	3.2	2.3	3.0	NA
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.					

TABLE 2-10

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS VS. SELECTED
REFERENCE GROUPS, 1980**

ATTRIBUTE	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Age	44.2	37.3	38.6	37.2	41.1
Education	16.0	14.4	15.6	15.4	15.7
% WHO ARE:					
Married	56.7	57.5	68.0	52.8	66.3
Head of Household	60.1	55.6	56.0	55.4	65.9
Women	48.1	41.6	50.2	52.5	35.2
White	95.2	91.9	88.9	93.9	94.3
Black	3.0	4.5	7.2	3.1	2.7
Other Race	1.8	3.6	3.9	3.0	3.0
Hispanic	1.9	3.8	3.1	4.0	1.5
Disabled	9.4	6.2	5.0	4.9	9.6
Veteran	21.0	19.1	20.9	15.7	38.7
Immigrant	7.2	7.8	6.5	8.1	7.3
Non-Citizen	2.8	3.6	2.9	4.0	3.8
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.					

TABLE 2-11

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS VS. SELECTED
REFERENCE GROUPS, 1990**

ATTRIBUTE	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Age	44.5	39.1	40.1	37.9	40.2
Education	15.6	14.2	15.4	15.4	15.3
% WITH DEGREES:					
Bachelor's	43.3	30.7	33.0	52.6	44.5
Master's	21.1	9.1	15.7	12.9	15.0
Profes- sional	3.0	1.5	7.5	1.4	0.8
Doctor's	6.4	1.1	3.1	1.3	2.7
% WHO ARE:					
Married	57.3	56.4	65.1	52.5	61.5
Head of Household	57.3	51.8	54.0	55.0	62.8
Women	50.3	46.9	53.4	52.9	49.9
White	94.7	89.8	86.2	91.6	92.2
Black	2.9	4.6	8.0	5.1	4.6
Other Race	2.4	5.6	5.8	3.3	3.2
Hispanic	1.2	2.9	2.2	1.9	1.3
Disabled	8.3	6.0	4.6	4.2	5.4
Veteran	17.2	13.3	15.8	10.7	23.3
Immigrant	7.5	10.9	9.1	7.4	6.3
Non-Citizen	3.3	5.4	3.7	3.7	1.8
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.					

TABLE 2-12

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS,
BY GENDER, RACE, AND ETHNICITY, 1970**

ATTRIBUTE	ALL	MEN	WOMEN	WHITES	BLACKS	HISPANICS
Age	43.0	42.6	43.6	43.1	37.7	38.6
Education	14.9	14.9	15.0	14.9	14.7	13.8
% WHO ARE:						
Married	67.2	74.0	55.7	67.8	44.4	71.4
Head of Household	68.6	90.6	31.7	68.6	74.1	71.4
Women	37.3	0	100.0	37.2	37.0	21.4
White	97.3	97.3	97.2	100.0	0	100.0
Black	2.2	2.2	2.1	0	100.0	0
Other Race	0.5	0.5	0.7	0	0	0
Hispanic	1.5	1.8	0.9	1.5	0	100.0
Disabled	8.1	9.2	6.0	8.2	5.0	14.3
Veteran	37.0	61.8	0	37.2	42.9	---
Immigrant	5.2	4.8	6.0	5.2	0	21.4
Non-Citizen	2.0	1.5	2.9	2.0	0	21.4
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.						

TABLE 2-13

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS,
BY GENDER, RACE, AND ETHNICITY, 1980**

ATTRIBUTE	ALL	MEN	WOMEN	WHITES	BLACKS	HISPANICS
Age	44.2	44.9	43.4	44.5	36.1	42.2
Education	16.0	16.1	15.9	16.1	15.0	15.0
% WHO ARE:						
Married	56.7	56.8	56.5	57.6	32.9	43.1
Head of Household	60.1	80.3	38.4	60.5	53.7	72.5
Women	48.1	0	100.0	48.0	52.4	33.3
White	95.2	95.5	94.9	100.0	0	70.6
Black	3.0	2.8	3.3	0	100.0	2.0
Other Race	1.8	1.7	1.8	0	0	27.4
Hispanic	1.9	2.4	1.3	1.4	1.2	100.0
Disabled	3.4	10.8	7.9	9.4	7.3	11.8
Veteran	21.0	38.3	2.2	21.3	20.7	19.6
Immigrant	7.2	7.9	6.3	6.9	3.7	27.5
Non-Citizen	2.8	3.3	2.4	2.6	2.4	9.8

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.

TABLE 2-14

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS,
BY GENDER, RACE, AND ETHNICITY, 1990**

ATTRIBUTE	ALL	MEN	WOMEN	WHITES	BLACKS	HISPANICS
Age	44.5	46.2	42.9	42.0	39.7	36.4
Education	15.8	16.0	15.8	16.0	14.4	15.1
% WITH DEGREES:						
Bachelor's	43.3	41.0	45.6	43.7	30.4	41.8
Master's	21.1	20.6	21.5	21.5	11.9	16.0
Professional	3.0	3.9	2.0	3.0	1.3	3.7
Doctor's	6.4	8.4	4.3	6.4	1.9	6.0
% WHO ARE:						
Married	57.3	56.5	58.2	57.8	40.8	53.8
Head of Household	57.3	76.0	38.9	57.7	54.2	44.3
Women	50.3	0	100.0	50.4	48.4	42.5
White	94.7	94.6	94.8	100.0	0	76.9
Black	2.9	3.0	2.8	0	100.0	3.6
Other Race	2.4	2.4	2.4	0	0	19.5
Hispanic	1.2	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.5	100.0
Disabled	8.3	9.2	7.4	8.3	5.4	4.6
Veteran	17.2	33.4	1.2	17.3	21.2	8.4
Immigrant	7.5	8.4	6.7	6.4	6.9	45.0
Non-Citizen	3.3	3.9	2.7	2.8	2.9	19.4
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.						

TABLE 2-15

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS AND SELECTED
REFERENCE GROUPS, 1970
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WHO ARE:					
Employed	78.7	77.1	79.5	85.0	NA
Unemployed	3.4	3.6	1.3	2.8	NA
Not in Work Force	17.9	19.4	19.1	18.7	NA
Worked in Census Yr.	85.4	83.2	82.5	82.7	NA
Worked in Prior Year	91.1	89.8	88.4	89.2	NA
In Same Occupation in 1965	43.5	44.7	43.2	45.3	NA
EMPLOYER:					
Private	48.8	68.5	50.8	84.5	NA
Government	10.6	9.2	41.5	7.7	NA
Self	39.3	21.7	7.4	7.3	NA
Full-Time*	43.6	40.4	42.7	47.8	NA
WORK TIME:					
Hours Worked	28.7 (37.0)	27.3 (37.0)	30.2 (40.0)	28.9 (37.0)	NA
Weeks Worked*	39.3 (51.0)	36.8 (51.0)	37.4 (51.0)	38.9 (51.0)	NA
*1969.					
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.					

TABLE 2-16

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS AND SELECTED
REFERENCE GROUPS, 1980
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WHO ARE:					
Employed	80.7	79.8	84.8	82.4	87.0
Unemployed	2.7	4.6	1.8	4.1	1.5
Not in Work Force	16.6	15.5	13.4	13.4	11.5
Worked in Census Year	87.4	85.7	87.3	87.4	89.3
Worked in Prior Year	86.5	91.1	92.0	92.3	93.1
EMPLOYER:					
Private	21.0	62.6	54.2	79.2	73.9
Government	4.5	6.9	38.3	11.5	17.2
Self	72.8	29.8	7.4	7.3	6.9
Full-Time*	34.8	42.8	51.6	51.9	60.9
WORK TIME:					
Hours Worked*	31.0 (38.0)	32.9 (40.0)	35.7 (40.0)	34.4 (40.0)	36.2 (40.0)
Weeks Worked*	35.6 (43.0)	37.8 (50.0)	40.5 (52.0)	39.8 (52.0)	41.8 (52.0)
*1979					
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.					

TABLE 2-17

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS AND SELECTED
REFERENCE GROUPS, 1990
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WHO ARE:					
Employed	83.2	80.9	86.2	85.2	86.1
Unemployed	2.7	4.1	1.4	3.0	3.7
Not in Work Force	14.1	15.0	11.9	11.8	10.1
Worked in Census Year	88.4	86.3	89.1	88.7	88.6
Worked in Prior Year	89.3	91.9	93.5	93.8	94.1
EMPLOYER:					
For-Profit	25.6	54.9	46.3	73.1	74.8
Non-Profit	6.7	6.9	14.7	9.2	5.3
Government	8.3	6.4	31.4	7.7	11.0
Self	58.0	31.0	7.4	9.6	8.4
Full-Time*	39.7	46.1	55.6	58.6	64.8
WORK TIME:					
Hours Worked*	32.7 (40.0)	34.4 (40.0)	37.2 (40.0)	36.7 (40.0)	37.9 (40.0)
Weeks Worked*	37.4 (49.0)	39.1 (50.0)	42.1 (52.0)	42.3 (52.0)	43.5 (52.0)
*1989					
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.					

TABLE 2-18

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS,
BY GENDER, RACE AND ETHNICITY, 1970
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	ALL	MEN	WOMEN	WHITES	BLACKS	HISPANICS
% WHO ARE:						
Employed	78.7	85.1	67.9	79.0	70.4	64.3
Unemployed	3.4	3.9	2.6	3.4	0	14.3
Not in Work Force	17.9	10.9	29.6	17.5	29.6	21.4
Worked in Census Year	85.4	90.3	77.1	85.4	88.9	83.8
Worked in Previous Year	91.1	96.1	82.9	91.1	96.3	71.4
In Same Occupation in 1965	43.5	45.1	40.8	43.4	50.0	35.7
EMPLOYER:						
Private	48.8	53.1	41.5	49.1	37.0	57.1
Government	10.6	10.7	10.5	10.3	22.2	7.1
Self	39.3	35.2	46.0	39.2	40.7	28.6
Full-Time*	43.6	55.0	24.4	44.1	33.3	28.6
WORK TIME:						
Hours Worked	28.7 (37.0)	33.1 (40.0)	21.4 (22.0)	28.9 (40.0)	26.0 (32.0)	24.3 (34.5)
Weeks Worked*	39.3 (51.0)	43.5 (51.0)	32.1 (43.5)	39.4 (51.0)	39.9 (48.5)	33.8 (47.2)
*1969.						
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.						

TABLE 2-19

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS,
BY GENDER, RACE AND ETHNICITY, 1980
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	ALL	MEN	WOMEN	WHITES	BLACKS	HISPANICS
% WHO ARE:						
Employed	80.7	84.7	76.4	80.8	76.8	86.3
Unemployed	2.7	2.4	3.0	2.7	0	2.0
Not in Work Force	16.6	12.9	20.6	16.5	23.2	11.8
Worked in Census Year	87.4	89.9	84.8	87.3	92.7	88.2
Worked in Prior Year	86.5	87.9	85.0	87.0	76.8	74.5
EMPLOYER:						
Private	21.0	19.1	23.1	20.7	25.6	21.6
Government	4.5	4.3	4.8	3.9	17.1	9.8
Self	72.8	75.2	70.1	73.5	56.1	68.6
Full-Time*	34.8	42.9	26.0	34.7	39.0	47.1
WORK TIME:						
Hours Worked*	31.0 (38.0)	38.0 (40.0)	27.3 (30.0)	31.1 (38.0)	26.9 (35.0)	28.2 (40.0)
Weeks Worked*	35.6 (48.0)	34.3 (50.0)	33.0 (40.0)	35.8 (48.0)	33.3 (48.0)	32.8 (50.0)
*1979.						
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.						

TABLE 2-20

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS,
BY GENDER, RACE AND ETHNICITY, 1990
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	ALL	MEN	WOMEN	WHITES	BLACKS	HISPANICS
% WHO ARE:						
Employed	83.2	85.9	80.5	83.3	81.0	88.0
Unemployed	2.7	2.9	2.5	2.6	6.9	2.5
Not in Work Force	14.1	11.2	16.9	14.1	12.1	9.5
Worked in Census Year	88.4	90.5	86.4	88.4	89.5	95.7
Worked in Previous Year	89.3	90.7	88.0	89.6	85.4	97.8
EMPLOYER:						
For-Profit	25.6	25.9	25.2	25.3	33.3	26.6
Non-Profit	6.7	5.9	7.4	6.5	8.7	11.4
Government	8.3	8.2	8.4	7.7	21.1	15.4
Self	58.0	59.0	57.1	59.1	35.2	44.3
Full-Time*	43.4	57.6	41.3	49.3	52.7	49.8
WORK TIME:						
Hours Worked*	32.7 (40.0)	36.0 (40.0)	29.5 (35.0)	32.8 (40.0)	32.5 (40.0)	37.2 (50.0)
Weeks Worked*	37.4 (49.0)	39.2 (50.0)	35.6 (48.0)	37.5 (49.0)	35.8 (48.0)	39.1 (40.0)
*1989.						
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.						

TABLE 2-21

**MEAN INCOMES OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS,
1969
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

TYPE OF INCOME	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Wage & Salary	5,821 (2,800)	5,533 (3,300)	6,717 (6,100)	7,148 (6,050)	NA
Self- Employment	2,621 (0)	1,428 (0)	1,067 (0)	476 (0)	NA
Total Earnings	8,473 (7,500)	6,968 (5,100)	7,797 (6,900)	7,638 (6,500)	NA
Asset Income	1,194 (0)	513 (0)	548 (0)	726 (0)	NA
Total Personal	9,829 (8,100)	7,611 (5,900)	8,463 (7,100)	8,491 (7,150)	NA
Total Household	16,003 (13,100)	13,247 (11,600)	14,045 (12,500)	14,789 (12,600)	NA
Hourly Wage	5.19 (3.79)	4.55 (3.05)	4.30 (3.60)	5.06 (3.44)	NA
% Below Poverty Line	6.3%	6.6%	4.3%	4.3%	NA
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.					

TABLE 2-22					
MEAN INCOMES OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1979 (MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)					
TYPE OF INCOME	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Wage & Salary	5,261 (0)	8,731 (4,505)	13,234 (12,005)	11,439 (9,505)	13,899 (14,005)
Self- Employment	5,645 (455)	2,391 (0)	1,408 (0)	724 (0)	684 (0)
Total Earnings	10,927 (5,005)	11,143 (7,705)	14,679 (12,505)	12,183 (10,005)	14,592 (14,005)
Asset Income	2,865 (25)	876 (0)	727 (0)	769 (0)	923 (5)
Total Personal	15,129 (9,395)	12,667 (9,005)	16,099 (13,505)	13,640 (10,910)	16,941 (15,860)
Total Household	29,348 (22,815)	25,484 (21,935)	28,290 (25,490)	25,732 (22,610)	28,050 (26,550)
Hourly Wage	12.94 (5.58)	9.14 (5.45)	9.81 (7.52)	8.06 (6.10)	8.86 (8.02)
% Below Poverty Line	9.3%	8.6%	4.5%	6.4%	3.8%
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.					

TABLE 2-23

**MEAN INCOMES OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS,
1989
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

TYPE OF INCOME	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Wage & Salary	15,251 (966)	16,781 (9,102)	25,751 (22,000)	23,292 (19,345)	26,157 (26,000)
Self-Employment	8,039 (0)	4,411 (0)	2,341 (0)	1,596 (0)	1,878 (0)
Total Earnings	23,335 (13,000)	21,233 (15,000)	28,126 (23,558)	24,912 (20,000)	28,044 (27,000)
Asset Income	4,066 (0)	1,654 (0)	1,475 (0)	1,894 (0)	1,494 (10)
Total Personal	30,089 (20,500)	24,077 (17,116)	30,965 (25,000)	27,936 (22,306)	31,425 (29,204)
Total Household	62,083 (49,251)	52,165 (43,000)	56,952 (49,020)	55,352 (46,000)	56,397 (50,537)
Hourly Wage	28.08 (10.00)	17.06 (9.61)	17.13 (12.50)	14.07 (10.82)	16.35 (13.90)
% Below Poverty Line	8.4%	9.1%	5.2%	7.4%	3.0%

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.

TABLE 2-24

**MEAN INCOMES OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS, BY GENDER, RACE AND ETHNICITY, 1969
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

TYPE OF INCOME	ALL	MEN	WOMEN	WHITES	BLACKS	HISPANICS
Wage & Salary	5,821 (2,800)	7,567 (7,950)	2,882 (0)	5,837 (2,700)	5,878 (4,000)	4,921 (5,500)
Self-Employment	2,621 (0)	3,154 (0)	1,726 (0)	2,655 (0)	1,781 (0)	543 (0)
Total Earnings	8,473 (7,500)	10,768 (10,000)	4,610 (2,500)	8,524 (7,500)	7,659 (8,000)	5,464 (6,000)
Asset Income	1,194 (0)	1,196 (0)	1,191 (0)	1,215 (0)	396 (0)	43 (0)
Total Personal	9,829 (8,100)	12,121 (10,300)	5,972 (3,900)	9,900 (8,200)	8,214 (8,000)	5,536 (6,100)
Total Household	16,003 (13,100)	15,307 (13,000)	17,164 (14,000)	16,178 (13,300)	10,393 (8,700)	9,621 (9,600)
Hourly Wage	5.19 (3.79)	6.15 (4.90)	3.58 (1.03)	5.20 (3.74)	5.26 (4.18)	3.70 (3.23)
% Below Poverty Line	6.3%	5.3%	7.9%	6.2%	3.7%	0.0%
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.						

TABLE 2-25

MEAN INCOMES OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS, BY GENDER, RACE AND ETHNICITY, 1979
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)

TYPE OF INCOME	ALL	MEN	WOMEN	WHITES	BLACKS	HISPANICS
Wage & Salary	5,261 (0)	6,920 (0)	3,744 (0)	5,285 (0)	4,716 (0)	5,807 (0)
Self-Employment	5,645 (455)	7,733 (1,405)	3,393 (105)	5,751 (505)	4,097 (0)	6,916 (0)
Total Earnings	10,927 (5,005)	14,659 (8,385)	6,903 (3,005)	11,058 (5,005)	8,813 (5,635)	12,728 (8,010)
Asset Income	2,865 (25)	3,504 (85)	2,177 (0)	2,994 (35)	69 (0)	1,123 (0)
Total Personal	15,129 (9,395)	19,807 (13,060)	10,085 (6,010)	15,423 (9,515)	9,172 (5,998)	15,192 (9,005)
Total Household	29,348 (22,815)	28,317 (21,760)	30,447 (23,762)	29,908 (23,215)	16,285 (14,705)	23,803 (17,760)
Hourly Wage	12.94 (5.58)	14.15 (6.95)	11.60 (4.28)	13.10 (5.56)	10.51 (6.12)	10.45 (5.80)
% Below Poverty Line	9.3%	10.5%	7.9%	8.9%	13.4%	17.6%
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.						

TABLE 2-26

**MEAN INCOMES OF ALL CENSUS AUTHORS, BY GENDER, RACE AND ETHNICITY, 1989
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

TYPE OF INCOME	ALL	MEN	WOMEN	WHITES	BLACKS	HISPANICS
Wage & Salary	15,251 (966)	20,465 (2,300)	10,101 (200)	15,235 (700)	17,068 (10,000)	13,833 (5,000)
Self-Employment	8,039 (0)	10,154 (0)	5,951 (0)	8,274 (0)	4,157 (0)	6,671 (0)
Total Earnings	23,335 (13,000)	30,663 (20,000)	16,099 (9,000)	23,553 (13,000)	21,337 (17,000)	20,504 (13,000)
Asset Income	4,066 (0)	5,067 (62)	3,077 (0)	4,215 (0)	1,128 (0)	1,727 (0)
Total Personal	30,089 (10,500)	39,612 (28,900)	20,685 (15,000)	30,475 (20,883)	25,760 (19,000)	24,401 (18,000)
Total Household	62,083 (49,251)	61,222 (48,400)	62,934 (49,905)	62,811 (49,992)	46,732 (34,778)	55,642 (38,000)
Hourly Wage	28.08 (10.00)	40.10 (11.99)	16.22 (8.40)	28.68 (10.00)	16.43 (9.14)	13.46 (11.05)
% Below Poverty Line	8.4%	9.4%	7.4%	7.8%	22.5%	11.3%
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.						

TABLE 2-27

**MEASURES OF LOW AND HIGH INCOMES AND INCOME VARIABILITY, ALL CENSUS
AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1969**

DESCRIPTION OF STATISTIC	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WORKERS
% WITH ZERO OR NEGATIVE INCOME FROM:					
Wage/Salary	40.9	27.0	17.8	16.3	NA
Self-Employment	66.1	80.3	91.9	92.0	NA
Total Earnings	12.9	12.9	12.7	12.3	NA
Asset Income	65.5	76.9	73.8	67.7	NA
All Sources	6.8	8.0	7.7	7.7	NA
% WITH INCOME AT MAXIMUM FROM:					
Wage/Salary	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.7	NA
Self-Employment	0.8	0.3	0.4	0.1	NA
Total Earnings	1.4	0.6	0.6	0.8	NA
Asset Income	0.2	0.1	0	0.1	NA
All Sources	1.7	0.8	0.9	1.0	NA
TOTAL EARNINGS VARIABILITY MEASURES:					
Coefficient of Variation	1.125	1.121	1.007	1.000	NA
Mean/Median	1.130	1.366	1.130	1.175	NA
<p>NOTES: Reporting of self-employment and total earnings, asset income and total income allows for negative amounts. Self-employment earnings combine farm and non-farm sources. Total earnings include all wage and salary and self-employment earnings. The maximum reported amount in each income category in the 1970 Census was \$50,000. Total earnings were not directly reported in the Census but were calculated by the authors. Income from all sources was also calculated by the authors. For consistency, the maximum in both these categories was also defined as \$50,000.</p> <p>SOURCE: Authors' tabulations and calculations from the 1970 Census PUMS.</p>					

TABLE 2-28

**MEASURES OF LOW AND HIGH INCOMES AND INCOME VARIABILITY, ALL CENSUS
AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1979**

DESCRIPTION OF STATISTIC	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WITH ZERO OR NEGATIVE INCOME FROM:					
Wage/Salary	63.2	28.7	12.3	12.9	11.5
Self-Employment	45.0	75.5	92.4	91.1	92.3
Total Earnings	17.5	10.3	8.0	7.7	6.9
Asset Income	48.7	64.8	58.4	56.7	49.4
All Sources	7.4	5.8	3.8	3.8	2.7
% WITH INCOME AT MAXIMUM FROM:					
Wage/Salary	1.0	0.5	0.7	0.3	0
Self-Employment	1.0	0.2	0.4	0.1	0
Asset Income	2.0	0.8	1.1	0.5	0
Royalty & Other	0.5	0.1	0	0.1	0
All Sources	3.0	1.0	1.3	0.7	0
TOTAL EARNINGS VARIABILITY MEASURES:					
Coefficient of Variation	1.474	1.154	0.935	0.986	0.738
Mean/Median	2.183	1.446	1.173	1.218	1.042

NOTES: Reporting of self-employment and total earnings, asset income and total income allows for negative amounts. Self-employment earnings are from non-farm sources only. Total earnings include all wage and salary and self-employment earnings, including farm. The maximum reported amount in each income category in the 1980 Census was \$75,000. Total earnings were not directly reported in the Census but were calculated by the authors. Income from all sources was also calculated by the authors. For consistency, the maximum in both these categories was also defined as \$75,000.

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations and calculations from the 1980 Census PUMS.

TABLE 2-29

**MEASURES OF LOW AND HIGH INCOMES AND INCOME VARIABILITY, ALL CENSUS
AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1989**

DESCRIPTION OF STATISTIC	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WITH ZERO OR NEGATIVE INCOME FROM:					
Wage/Salary	47.5	27.6	10.7	11.9	10.7
Self-Employment	53.4	71.7	91.1	85.5	88.0
Total Earnings	14.4	9.9	6.8	6.8	6.3
Asset Income	51.4	66.5	60.1	55.6	49.1
All Sources	6.4	5.6	2.9	2.8	2.4
% WITH INCOME AT MAXIMUM FROM:					
Wage/Salary	2.5	1.5	2.3	1.8	0.7
Self-Employment	1.4	0.6	0.8	0.2	0.3
Total Earnings	4.1	2.3	3.2	2.2	1.1
Asset Income	3.0	0.9	0.6	1.1	0.5
All Sources	5.7	2.8	3.8	2.8	1.4
TOTAL EARNINGS VARIABILITY MEASURES:					
Coefficient of Variation	1.433	1.248	1.013	1.023	0.732
Mean/Median	1.795	1.416	1.194	1.246	1.039
<p>NOTES: Reporting of self-employment and total earnings, asset income and total income allows for negative amounts. Self-employment earnings are from non-farm sources only. Total earnings include all wage and salary and self-employment earnings, including farm. The maximum reported amounts differed among income categories in the 1990 Census. For consistency, maximums in all categories except asset income were defined as \$90,000. The maximum in asset income was set by the Census at \$40,000. See the text for more detail.</p> <p>SOURCE: Authors' tabulations and calculations from the 1990 Census PUMS.</p>					

TABLE 2-30
EARNINGS FUNCTIONS
1969, 1979, 1989

VARIABLE	1969	1979	1989
Constant	6.65 (47.28)	7.40 (60.06)	6.89 (55.90)
Author	-0.39 (-3.57)	-0.57 (-6.29)	-0.34 (-3.57)
Architect	-0.12 (-1.28)	0.35 (4.38)	0.59 (6.35)
Performer	-0.59 (-6.87)	-0.27 (-3.49)	-0.04 (-0.48)
Visual Artist	-0.33 (-3.87)	-0.12 (-1.62)	0.07 (0.85)
Years of Schooling	0.05 (8.11)	0.06 (13.77)	0.14 (31.31)
Vocational Training	0.22 (7.08)	na	na
Experience	0.09 (27.12)	0.05 (17.47)	0.05 (21.42)
Experience Squared	-0.002 (-41.22)	-0.001 (-30.79)	-0.001 (-35.74)
Same Occupation (t-5)	0.68 (19.13)	na	na
Now in School	na	-0.79 (-22.33)	-0.74 (-24.63)
Female	-1.38 (-35.58)	-0.89 (-33.43)	-0.69 (-30.62)
Married	0.14 (3.77)	0.11 (4.29)	-0.33 (-1.60)
Household Head	1.42 (33.66)	0.18 (3.17)	1.00 (46.02)
Child Under 6	-0.68 (-17.68)	-0.74 (-18.39)	-1.21 (-27.00)
Black	-0.19 (-2.45)	-0.53 (-10.14)	-0.38 (-8.50)
Asian	0.25 (2.02)	0.25 (3.15)	-0.08 (-1.41)
Other Ethnic	-0.47 (-2.10)	-0.26 (-2.79)	0.04 (0.48)
Hispanic	0.13 (2.60)	0.09 (1.28)	-0.05 (-0.80)

VARIABLE	1969	1979	1989
Not A Citizen	-0.45 (-4.35)	-0.70 (-9.00)	-0.47 (-8.34)
Migrant	0.10 (2.14)	0.18 (3.17)	0.04 (0.89)
English Only	na	0.17 (3.86)	0.05 (1.45)
Veteran	na	0.24 (7.55)	-0.04 (-1.12)
Work Disability	-0.45 (-9.45)	-1.61 (-35.58)	-1.64 (-41.43)
Self Employed	-0.17 (-4.66)	-0.75 (-29.09)	-0.51 (-24.12)
Federal Employee	0.07 (0.81)	-0.08 (-0.97)	0.26 (3.81)
State/Local Employee	-0.08 (-1.22)	-0.16 (-3.09)	-0.03 (-0.66)
New England	0.01 (0.15)	-0.06 (-1.19)	-0.07 (-1.74)
South Atlantic	-0.07 (-1.51)	-0.02 (-0.60)	-0.13 (-4.23)
East North Central	0.03 (0.59)	0.05 (1.32)	-0.26 (-7.93)
West North Central	-0.11 (-1.51)	0.05 (1.08)	-0.22 (-5.01)
East South Central	0.06 (1.06)	-0.08 (-1.43)	-0.35 (-6.88)
West South Central	-0.04 (-0.62)	0.01 (0.30)	-0.48 (-12.27)
Mountain	-0.15 (-2.32)	-0.09 (-1.80)	-0.40 (-8.18)
Pacific	-0.14 (-3.07)	-0.06 (-1.94)	-0.09 (-3.15)
Other Household Income (natural log)	-0.06 (-13.13)	-0.25 (-7.10)	-0.05 (-16.71)
Adjusted R ²	.294	.189	.168
n	32,763	62,748	1,988,185 ¹

a) t-statistics in parentheses

b) Population estimate from weighted sample. Standard errors are adjusted, as are t-statistics.

SOURCE: Wassall and Alper (1992a).

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-1

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS
IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1970**

ATTRIBUTE	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Age	42.6	38.6	39.0	39.8	NA
Education	15.0	13.8	15.1	15.0	NA
% WHO ARE:					
Married	70.2	67.3	74.2	63.4	NA
Head of Household	74.5	66.4	62.0	65.9	NA
Women	32.0	29.7	41.3	40.9	NA
White	97.8	94.7	92.9	96.9	NA
Black	1.8	3.5	5.6	2.0	NA
Other Race	0.4	1.8	1.5	1.1	NA
Hispanic	1.4	2.9	1.9	1.5	NA
Disabled	7.5	7.1	5.1	5.4	NA
Veteran	42.9	35.9			NA
Immigrant	5.1	8.3	5.5	5.7	NA
Non-Citizen	1.9	3.1	2.2	2.8	NA
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-2

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS
IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1980**

ATTRIBUTE	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Age	43.2	36.8	37.9	36.7	40.3
Education	16.2	14.5	15.7	15.5	15.7
% WHO ARE:					
Married	59.3	57.4	68.2	51.8	66.2
Head of Household	63.1	59.5	59.4	58.7	68.4
Women	45.8	38.2	47.3	49.8	32.5
White	95.4	92.1	88.8	94.3	93.9
Black	2.8	4.3	7.2	3.3	3.0
Other Race	1.8	3.6	4.0	2.4	3.1
Hispanic	2.0	3.8	3.1	3.3	1.7
Disabled	7.7	4.7	3.5	4.0	6.9
Veteran	22.1	20.5	22.3	16.8	42.0
Immigrant	7.1	7.6	6.4	6.4	6.1
Non-Citizen	2.8	3.4	2.8	2.9	2.6
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-3

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS
IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1990**

ATTRIBUTE	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Age	43.6	38.3	39.2	37.0	39.2
Education	15.8	14.4	15.3	15.5	15.4
% WITH DEGREES:					
Bachelor's	43.5	32.5	33.7	54.9	45.6
Master's	21.7	9.6	16.2	13.1	14.9
Profes- sional	2.9	1.6	8.0	1.4	0.7
Doctor's	6.6	1.2	3.3	1.3	2.6
% WHO ARE:					
Married	58.1	57.6	67.0	51.8	60.7
Head of Household	59.2	34.7	55.5	57.4	63.8
Women	48.3	44.3	52.7	51.1	50.1
White	94.6	89.9	86.2	91.5	92.2
Black	2.9	4.5	8.0	5.2	4.6
Other Race	2.5	5.6	5.8	3.3	3.2
Hispanic	1.2	2.9	2.2	2.0	1.4
Disabled	6.7	4.4	3.1	3.0	4.4
Veteran	16.6	12.4	14.0	9.7	21.9
Immigrant	7.3	10.8	9.2	7.2	5.8
Non-Citizen	3.4	5.3	3.6	3.6	1.6
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-4

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS
IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1970
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WHO ARE:					
Employed	95.8	95.6	98.3	96.5	NA
Unemployed	4.2	4.4	1.7	3.5	NA
Not in Work Force	0	0	0	0	NA
Worked in Census Yr.	98.0	98.0	98.9	98.8	NA
Worked in Prior Year	98.3	98.1	98.1	98.9	NA
In Same Occupation in 1965	44.7	48.5	46.4	48.2	NA
EMPLOYER:					
Private	49.2	67.6	51.7	83.7	NA
Government	11.1	9.5	40.2	8.5	NA
Self	38.4	22.4	8.0	7.7	NA
Full-Time*	53.1	50.1	52.8	58.8	NA
WORK TIME:					
Hours Worked	35.0 (40.0)	33.9 (40.0)	37.3 (40.0)	35.5 (40.0)	NA
Weeks Worked*	44.4 (51.0)	42.9 (51.0)	43.9 (51.1)	45.2 (51.0)	NA
*1969.					
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-5

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS
IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1980
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WHO ARE:					
Employed	96.8	94.5	98.0	95.2	98.3
Unemployed	3.2	5.5	2.0	4.8	1.7
Not in Work Force	0	0	0	0	0
Worked in Census Year	98.1	96.5	98.4	97.7	98.7
Worked in Prior Year	92.0	95.8	98.0	98.2	98.7
EMPLOYER:					
Private	20.7	62.4	54.6	80.5	75.8
Government	4.5	6.9	37.5	10.6	15.6
Self	73.3	30.1	7.7	7.0	6.5
Full-Time*	40.1	49.6	58.8	59.3	68.0
WORK TIME:					
Hours Worked*	33.7 (40.0)	35.5 (40.0)	38.6 (40.0)	37.4 (40.0)	38.7 (40.0)
Weeks Worked*	39.6 (50.0)	42.1 (52.0)	44.9 (52.0)	44.0 (52.0)	45.5 (52.0)
*1979.					
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-6

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS
IN THE EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1990
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WHO ARE:					
Employed	96.8	95.2	97.9	96.6	95.8
Unemployed	3.2	4.8	2.1	3.4	4.2
Not in Work Force	0	0	0	0	0
Worked in Census Year	98.3	97.4	98.0	98.1	97.3
Worked in Prior Year	92.9	96.6	98.3	98.1	98.4
EMPLOYER:					
For-Profit	26.2	55.7	47.4	74.4	76.2
Non-Profit	6.7	6.9	14.9	9.3	5.2
Government	8.3	5.6	30.1	6.9	10.2
Self	57.7	31.3	7.5	9.3	8.0
Full-Time*	45.1	53.1	61.9	65.5	71.3
WORK TIME:					
Hours Worked*	35.0 (40.0)	37.0 (40.0)	39.6 (40.0)	39.1 (40.0)	39.8 (40.0)
Weeks Worked*	40.9 (50.0)	43.3 (52.0)	45.9 (52.0)	45.9 (52.0)	46.8 (52.0)
*1989.					
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-7

**MEAN INCOMES OF AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS IN THE
EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1969
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

TYPE OF INCOME	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Wage & Salary	6,841 (6,300)	6,612 (5,400)	8,017 (7,500)	8,432 (7,600)	NA
Self- Employment	2,765 (0)	1,688 (0)	1,297 (0)	580 (0)	NA
Total Earnings	9,630 (8,700)	8,305 (7,000)	9,328 (8,000)	9,028 (8,000)	NA
Asset Income	1,064 (0)	439 (0)	447 (0)	606 (0)	NA
Total Personal	10,809 (9,500)	8,827 (7,400)	9,845 (8,200)	9,730 (8,500)	NA
Total Household	16,102 (13,300)	13,793 (12,000)	14,679 (13,100)	14,833 (12,900)	NA
Hourly Wage	6.32 (4.72)	5.65 (3.98)	5.31 (4.34)	6.22 (4.19)	NA
% Below Poverty Line	4.8%	4.9%	3.3%	3.9%	NA
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-8

**MEAN INCOMES OF AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS IN THE
EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1979
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

TYPE OF INCOME	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Wage & Salary	5,968 (0)	9,942 (6,505)	14,829 (13,195)	12,913 (10,455)	15,381 (15,085)
Self-Employment	6,312 (1,005)	2,696 (0)	1,599 (0)	815 (0)	642 (0)
Total Earnings	12,276 (6,385)	12,657 (9,605)	16,465 (14,005)	13,750 (11,225)	16,033 (15,245)
Asset Income	2,821 (25)	811 (0)	642 (0)	719 (0)	845 (0)
Total Personal	16,275 (10,065)	13,950 (10,200)	17,518 (14,805)	14,915 (12,005)	18,034 (18,005)
Total Household	29,909 (23,328)	26,290 (22,720)	29,064 (26,415)	26,651 (23,185)	28,577 (27,055)
Hourly Wage	11.66 (5.73)	9.13 (5.97)	9.48 (7.60)	8.25 (6.26)	9.04 (8.13)
% Below Poverty Line	8.8%	7.6%	3.6%	5.2%	3.9%
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-9

**MEAN INCOMES OF AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS IN THE
EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1989
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

TYPE OF INCOME	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Wage & Salary	17,015 (2,686)	18,985 (12,000)	28,465 (25,000)	25,732 (21,318)	28,307 (27,500)
Self-Employment	8,742 (0)	4,96 (0)	2,616 (0)	1,753 (0)	2,004 (0)
Total Earnings	25,800 (16,500)	23,992 (18,000)	31,117 (26,000)	27,511 (22,750)	30,321 (28,897)
Asset Income	3,807 (0)	1,472 (0)	1,272 (0)	1,599 (0)	1,276 (12)
Total Personal	31,788 (22,100)	26,287 (20,000)	33,139 (27,000)	29,794 (24,050)	32,843 (30,000)
Total Household	63,019 (50,000)	53,604 (44,000)	58,896 (50,410)	56,373 (47,000)	57,386 (51,500)
Hourly Wage	27.28 (10.58)	16.76 (10.38)	17.31 (13.46)	14.63 (11.54)	16.69 (14.42)
% Below Poverty Line	7.4%	7.2%	3.3%	5.7%	2.2%
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-10

**MEASURES OF LOW AND HIGH INCOMES AND INCOME VARIABILITY,
AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS IN THE
EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1969**

DESCRIPTION OF STATISTIC	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WITH ZERO OR NEGATIVE INCOME FROM:					
Wage/Salary	34.1	19.4	8.4	6.5	NA
Self-Employment	64.5	77.9	90.5	90.6	NA
Total Earnings	5.5	3.9	2.5	1.7	NA
Asset Income	65.8	77.2	74.4	67.6	NA
All Sources	3.1	2.9	1.9	1.1	NA
% WITH INCOME AT MAXIMUM FROM:					
Wage/Salary	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.7	NA
Self-Employment	0.9	0.3	0.5	0.1	NA
Total Earnings	1.5	0.7	0.7	0.8	NA
Asset Income	0.2	0	0.1	0.1	NA
All Sources	1.7	1.0	1.0	1.1	NA
TOTAL EARNINGS VARIABILITY MEASURES:					
Coefficient of Variation	0.958	0.951	0.842	0.829	NA
Mean/Median	1.107	1.186	1.166	1.128	NA
<p>NOTES: Reporting of self-employment and total earnings, asset income and total income allows for negative amounts. Self-employment earnings combine farm and non-farm sources. Total earnings include all wage and salary and self-employment earnings. The maximum reported amount in each income category in the 1970 Census was \$50,000. Total earnings were not directly reported in the Census but were calculated by the authors. Income from all sources was also calculated by the authors. For consistency, the maximum in both these categories was also defined as \$50,000.</p> <p>SOURCE: Authors' tabulations and calculations from the 1970 Census PUMS.</p>					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-11

**MEASURES OF LOW AND HIGH INCOMES AND INCOME VARIABILITY,
AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS IN THE
EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1979**

DESCRIPTION OF STATISTIC	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WITH ZERO OR NEGATIVE INCOME FROM:					
Wage/Salary	61.2	24.6	6.9	7.3	6.5
Self-Employment	41.3	73.9	91.7	90.8	92.2
Total Earnings	12.8	5.4	2.3	2.1	1.7
Asset Income	47.4	63.6	57.3	55.3	47.6
All Sources	5.5	3.4	1.4	1.3	0.9
% WITH INCOME AT MAXIMUM FROM:					
Wage/Salary	1.2	0.6	0.7	0.4	0
Self-Employment	0.4	0.2	0.5	0.1	0
Total Earnings	2.3	0.9	1.3	0.6	0
Asset Income	0.4	0.1	0	0.1	0
All Sources	3.2	1.1	1.5	0.8	0
TOTAL EARNINGS VARIABILITY MEASURES:					
Coefficient of Variation	1.363	1.036	0.830	0.877	0.648
Mean/Median	1.923	1.313	1.176	1.225	1.052

NOTES: Reporting of self-employment and total earnings, asset income and total income allows for negative amounts. Self-employment earnings are from non-farm sources only. Total earnings include all wage and salary and self-employment earnings, including farm. The maximum reported amount in each income category in the 1980 Census was \$75,000. Total earnings were not directly reported in the Census but were calculated by the authors. Income from all sources was also calculated by the authors. For consistency, the maximum in both these categories was also defined as \$75,000.

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations and calculations from the 1980 Census PUMS.

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-12

**MEASURES OF LOW AND HIGH INCOMES AND INCOME VARIABILITY,
AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS IN THE
EXPERIENCED CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE, 1989**

DESCRIPTION OF STATISTIC	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WITH ZERO OR NEGATIVE INCOME FROM:					
Wage/Salary	44.4	23.5	5.9	7.4	6.3
Self-Employment	51.8	69.9	90.5	84.8	87.5
Total Earnings	10.8	5.0	1.9	2.3	2.1
Asset Income	51.5	65.9	59.8	55.4	48.8
All Sources	4.9	3.3	1.2	1.3	1.1
% WITH INCOME AT MAXIMUM FROM:					
Wage/Salary	2.8	1.7	2.6	2.1	0.8
Self-Employment	1.5	0.6	0.9	0.2	0.3
Total Earnings	4.6	2.6	3.6	2.4	1.2
Asset Income	2.7	0.8	0.5	0.8	0.4
All Sources	6.1	3.1	4.2	3.1	1.5
TOTAL EARNINGS VARIABILITY MEASURES:					
Coefficient of Variation	1.330	1.132	0.924	0.931	0.658
Mean/Median	1.564	1.333	1.197	1.209	1.049

NOTES: Reporting of self-employment and total earnings, asset income and total income allows for negative amounts. Self-employment earnings are from non-farm sources only. Total earnings include all wage and salary and self-employment earnings, including farm. The maximum reported amounts differed among income categories in the 1990 Census. For consistency, maximums in all categories except asset income were defined as \$90,000. The maximum in asset income was set by the Census at \$40,000. See the text for more detail.

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations and calculations from the 1990 Census PUMS.

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-13

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND
SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1970**

ATTRIBUTE	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Age	41.9	40.6	40.2	41.0	NA
Education	14.9	13.9	15.0	15.0	NA
% WHO ARE:					
Married	75.5	78.6	80.0	69.3	NA
Head of Household	86.1	82.8	78.1	78.3	NA
Women	20.9	17.2	25.0	30.9	NA
White	98.4	95.7	93.9	96.8	NA
Black	1.6	2.6	4.5	2.1	NA
Other Race	0	1.7	1.6	1.1	NA
Hispanic	0.9	2.6	1.9	1.6	NA
Disabled	7.5	5.6	4.6	4.3	NA
Veteran	58.7	49.5	----	----	NA
Immigrant	4.5	8.8	5.7	5.9	NA
Non-Citizen	0.9	2.9	2.3	3.0	NA
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-14

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND
SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1980**

ATTRIBUTE	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Age	43.2	38.2	38.8	38.8	42.5
Education	16.2	14.7	15.6	15.5	15.5
% WHO ARE:					
Married	61.0	64.2	71.2	57.1	74.2
Head of Household	74.2	72.3	70.9	73.2	75.5
Women	35.9	27.9	35.6	40.4	28.9
White	95.0	92.7	89.6	96.2	95.0
Black	3.4	3.7	6.4	2.4	2.5
Other Race	1.6	3.6	4.0	1.4	2.5
Hispanic	2.5	3.7	2.9	2.9	1.3
Disabled	4.5	3.4	3.2	2.9	5.7
Veteran	27.1	27.7	29.2	23.1	48.4
Immigrant	7.1	7.8	6.6	5.7	6.3
Non-Citizen	3.2	3.3	2.7	2.1	1.9
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-15

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND
SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1990**

ATTRIBUTE	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Age	42.8	38.7	39.3	37.7	39.8
Education	16.5	14.6	15.3	15.6	15.3
% WITH DEGREES:					
Bachelor's	44.1	34.9	32.9	57.8	43.9
Master's	21.3	9.8	13.9	13.7	14.5
Profes- sional	3.5	1.8	9.2	1.3	0.6
Doctor's	7.1	1.1	3.6	1.3	2.7
% WHO ARE:					
Married	58.8	60.9	68.2	54.7	62.4
Head of Household	66.9	64.8	64.7	64.9	68.3
Women	41.4	35.7	43.3	45.9	46.3
White	94.1	90.5	86.4	91.6	92.4
Black	3.2	4.2	7.9	5.5	4.5
Other Race	2.7	5.3	5.7	2.9	3.1
Hispanic	1.3	2.7	2.1	1.8	1.4
Disabled	4.7	3.0	2.6	2.3	4.2
Veteran	18.6	15.7	18.5	11.5	24.6
Immigrant	6.5	10.2	9.1	6.2	6.1
Non-Citizen	3.3	4.6	3.2	2.9	1.6

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-16

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND
SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1970
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WHO ARE:					
Employed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	NA
Unemployed	0	0	0	0	NA
Not in Work Force	0	0	0	0	NA
Worked in Census Yr.	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	NA
Worked in Prior Year	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	NA
In Same Occupation in 1965	50.4	58.9	53.4	56.1	NA
EMPLOYER:					
Private	58.4	68.8	59.5	83.5	NA
Government	13.3	9.5	31.1	8.9	NA
Self	26.2	21.3	9.3	7.3	NA
Full-Time*	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	NA
WORK TIME:					
Hours Worked	44.3 (40.0)	44.7 (40.0)	44.4 (40.0)	43.1 (40.0)	NA
Weeks Worked*	51.0 (51.0)	51.0 (51.0)	51.0 (51.0)	51.0 (51.0)	NA
*1969.					
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-17

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND
SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1980
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WHO ARE:					
Employed	95.1	96.6	96.7	97.1	97.5
Unemployed	1.0	1.4	0.7	1.8	1.3
Not in Work Force	3.9	2.0	1.4	1.1	1.3
Worked in Census Year	97.5	98.5	98.4	99.2	98.7
Worked in Prior Year	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
EMPLOYER:					
Private	26.0	65.0	61.2	83.7	79.2
Government	5.9	7.1	30.3	9.4	13.2
Self	67.4	27.5	5.9	4.5	5.7
Full-Time*	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
WORK TIME:					
Hours Worked*	45.7 (40.0)	43.9 (40.0)	43.2 (40.0)	42.8 (40.0)	41.8 (40.0)
Weeks Worked*	51.7 (52.0)	51.7 (52.0)	51.8 (52.0)	51.9 (52.0)	51.9 (52.0)
*1979.					
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-18

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND
SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1990
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

ATTRIBUTE:	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WHO ARE:					
Employed	96.3	96.9	97.9	97.6	96.2
Unemployed	1.0	1.3	0.7	1.1	1.9
Not in Work Force	2.0	1.8	1.4	1.3	1.1
Worked in Census Year	98.5	98.6	99.0	99.1	98.6
Worked in Prior Year	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
EMPLOYER:					
For-Profit	33.6	60.1	52.8	78.0	79.1
Non-Profit	8.1	5.0	13.1	8.4	4.7
Government	11.6	6.9	26.8	7.2	11.5
Self	46.1	27.0	7.3	6.3	4.7
Full-Time*	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
WORK TIME:					
Hours Worked*	45.6 (40.0)	45.0 (40.0)	44.1 (40.0)	43.8 (40.0)	42.6 (40.0)
Weeks Worked*	51.6 (52.0)	51.8 (52.0)	51.9 (52.0)	51.8 (52.0)	51.9 (52.0)
*1989.					
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-19

**MEAN INCOMES OF FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE
GROUPS, 1969
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

TYPE OF INCOME	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Wage & Salary	9,264 (10,000)	8,988 (8,800)	9,941 (9,100)	10,477 (9,200)	NA
Self- Employment	2,781 (0)	2,145 (0)	1,737 (0)	674 (0)	NA
Total Earnings	12,056 (10,750)	11,142 (10,000)	11,694 (10,000)	11,182 (9,800)	NA
Asset Income	858 (0)	419 (0)	463 (0)	622 (0)	NA
Total Personal	12,990 (11,000)	11,611 (10,000)	12,210 (10,000)	11,864 (10,300)	NA
Total Household	16,957 (14,200)	15,178 (13,100)	15,699 (13,900)	15,980 (13,600)	NA
Hourly Wage	5.46 (5.00)	4.97 (4.41)	5.20 (2.35)	5.18 (2.46)	NA
% Below Poverty Line	1.5%	2.1%	1.4%	0.9%	NA
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1970 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-20

**MEAN INCOMES OF FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE
GROUPS, 1979
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

TYPE OF INCOME	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Wage & Salary	9,621 (0)	14,534 (13,005)	18,543 (16,405)	17,785 (15,005)	19,038 (18,635)
Self- Employment	8,351 (2,005)	3,390 (0)	2,047 (0)	805 (0)	966 (0)
Total Earnings	17,951 (13,005)	17,955 (15,005)	20,632 (17,285)	18,586 (15,505)	20,008 (19,195)
Asset Income	2,519 (35)	819 (0)	705 (0)	845 (5)	764 (45)
Total Personal	21,266 (15,700)	19,016 (15,720)	21,613 (18,005)	19,675 (16,210)	21,704 (20,710)
Total Household	31,858 (25,010)	29,056 (25,365)	31,424 (28,065)	29,273 (25,765)	32,516 (30,008)
Hourly Wage	7.80 (5.83)	8.00 (6.81)	9.21 (7.95)	8.46 (7.21)	9.38 (8.96)
% Below Poverty Line	5.6%	2.7%	1.2%	0.8%	0.6%

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1980 Census PUMS.

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-21

**MEAN INCOMES OF FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE
GROUPS, 1989
(MEDIAN IN PARENTHESES)**

TYPE OF INCOME	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
Wage & Salary	25,054 (20,000)	26,550 (23,000)	34,658 (30,000)	32,368 (27,359)	33,132 (30,776)
Self- Employment	10,775 (0)	5,634 (0)	3,042 (0)	1,607 (0)	1,638 (0)
Total Earnings	35,896 (29,113)	32,232 (26,000)	37,739 (30,300)	33,996 (28,000)	34,775 (31,900)
Asset Income	2,991 (0)	1,362 (0)	1,296 (0)	1,452 (0)	1,114 (15)
Total Personal	40,214 (31,181)	34,035 (27,500)	39,529 (31,640)	35,777 (29,201)	36,901 (33,183)
Total Household	66,711 (53,422)	57,479 (48,100)	62,050 (53,000)	59,961 (50,000)	59,261 (53,500)
Hourly Wage	15.52 (12.73)	13.97 (11.54)	16.44 (13.92)	15.03 (12.60)	15.83 (14.42)
% Below Poverty Line	2.9%	2.5%	1.0%	1.0%	0.2%
SOURCE: Authors' tabulations from the 1990 Census PUMS.					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-22

MEASURES OF LOW AND HIGH INCOMES AND INCOME VARIABILITY, FULL-TIME,
YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1969

DESCRIPTION OF STATISTIC	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WITH ZERO OR NEGATIVE INCOME FROM:					
Wage/Salary	21.4	15.5	7.1	4.8	NA
Self-Employment	72.9	78.5	89.0	90.8	NA
Total Earnings	1.8	1.0	0.3	0.2	NA
Asset Income	65.9	74.7	71.4	65.7	NA
All Sources	0.9	0.8	0.2	0	NA
% WITH INCOME AT MAXIMUM FROM:					
Wage/Salary	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.9	NA
Self-Employment	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.2	NA
Total Earnings	1.5	1.0	0.9	1.1	NA
Asset Income	0	0	0.1	0.2	NA
All Sources	1.6	1.1	1.4	1.6	NA
TOTAL EARNINGS VARIABILITY MEASURES:					
Coefficient of Variation	0.771	0.710	0.683	0.633	NA
Mean/Median	1.122	1.142	1.169	1.141	NA

NOTES: Reporting of self-employment and total earnings, asset income and total income allows for negative amounts. Self-employment earnings combine farm and non-farm sources. Total earnings include all wage and salary and self-employment earnings. The maximum reported amount in each income category in the 1970 Census was \$50,000. Total earnings were not directly reported in the Census but were calculated by the authors. Income from all sources was also calculated by the authors. For consistency, the maximum in both these categories was also defined as \$50,000.

SOURCE: Authors' tabulations and calculations from the 1970 Census PUMS.

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-23

MEASURES OF LOW AND HIGH INCOMES AND INCOME VARIABILITY, FULL-TIME, YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1979

DESCRIPTION OF STATISTIC	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WITH ZERO OR NEGATIVE INCOME FROM:					
Wage/Salary	52.3	18.8	5.0	3.5	5.0
Self-Employment	40.4	75.7	90.9	93.0	93.1
Total Earnings	3.8	1.3	0.2	0.2	0
Asset Income	46.6	58.2	52.0	49.8	44.0
All Sources	2.0	1.0	0.1	0.2	0
% WITH INCOME AT MAXIMUM FROM:					
Wage/Salary	1.8	0.8	1.0	0.6	0
Self-Employment	1.5	0.3	0.7	0	0
Total Earnings	3.5	1.3	1.8	0.8	0
Asset Income	0.6	0.1	0	0.2	0
All Sources	4.7	1.5	2.0	1.1	0
TOTAL EARNINGS VARIABILITY MEASURES:					
Coefficient of Variation	1.041	0.757	0.675	0.627	0.469
Mean/Median	1.380	1.197	1.194	1.199	1.042
<p>NOTES: Reporting of self-employment and total earnings, asset income and total income allows for negative amounts. Self-employment earnings are from non-farm sources only. Total earnings include include all wage and salary and self-employment earnings, including farm. The maximum reported amount in each income category in the 1980 Census was \$75,000. Total earnings were not directly reported in the Census but were calculated by the authors. Income from all sources was also calculated by the authors. For consistency, the maximum in both these categories was also defined as \$75,000.</p> <p>SOURCE: Authors' tabulations and calculations from the 1980 Census PUMS.</p>					

APPENDIX TABLE 2A-24

**MEASURES OF LOW AND HIGH INCOMES AND INCOME VARIABILITY, FULL-TIME,
YEAR-ROUND AUTHORS AND SELECTED REFERENCE GROUPS, 1989**

DESCRIPTION OF STATISTIC	AUTHORS	ARTISTS	PROF/TECH WORKERS	EDITORS & REPORTERS	TECHNICAL WRITERS
% WITH ZERO OR NEGATIVE INCOME FROM:					
Wage/Salary	32.8	17.1	3.8	3.5	2.8
Self-Employment	55.7	72.9	90.8	87.1	90.8
Total Earnings	2.7	1.2	0.1	0.2	0.2
Asset Income	52.3	62.9	55.9	52.4	48.3
All Sources	1.5	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.2
% WITH INCOME AT MAXIMUM FROM:					
Wage/Salary	3.5	2.4	3.5	2.7	0.9
Self-Employment	1.9	0.8	1.2	0.3	0.3
Total Earnings	6.0	3.5	4.8	3.1	1.5
Asset Income	2.0	0.7	0.5	0.7	0.4
All Sources	7.6	4.0	5.4	4.0	1.7
TOTAL EARNINGS VARIABILITY MEASURES:					
Coefficient of Variation	0.969	0.868	0.739	0.762	0.552
Mean/Median	1.233	1.240	1.258	1.214	1.090
<p>NOTES: Reporting of self-employment and total earnings, asset income and total income allows for negative amounts. Self-employment earnings are from non-farm sources only. Total earnings include all wage and salary and self-employment earnings, including farm. The maximum reported amounts differed among income categories in the 1990 Census. For consistency, maximums in all categories except asset income were defined as \$90,000. The maximum in asset income was set by the Census at \$40,000. See the text for more detail.</p> <p>SOURCE: Authors' tabulations and calculations from the 1990 Census PUMS.</p>					

CHAPTER 3

AUTHORS IN THE U.S. AND ELSEWHERE

This chapter explores the economic condition of writers over the period 1970 to 1990, as well. It differs from the previous chapters because it does not use data from the U.S. decennial censuses. The Census, while complete in some important dimensions, especially coverage of the population, is quite incomplete in others. It is particularly weak in describing the complexities of the labor market experiences and income generating opportunities utilized by writers and other artists.

This chapter will first provide an exploration of multiple job holding among writers, an area that the decennial census cannot address, using the Census' close cousin the Current Population Survey. It will then provide information on this issue, along with a number of others relevant to the writers' socioeconomic condition, utilizing data from a variety of surveys and studies that are not as comprehensive as those undertaken by the Census Bureau. The last part of the chapter will be a comparison of the U.S. writers' socioeconomic condition to writers in several other countries. It will provide information on the commonalities that exist across countries and the differences.

Current Population Survey

Multiple job holding is a characteristic of artists' and writers' labor market behavior that, somewhat, sets them apart from most other workers. As the term suggests, multiple job holding is a situation in which a person works at more than one job during a period of time. Generally the term implies that these jobs are held concurrently, but the data does not always enable confirmation of this.

Unfortunately information on multiple job holding patterns is not available from the U.S. decennial census. Until recently this information was collected irregularly for the nation by the Census Bureau in a supplemental questionnaire as part of the Current Population Survey (CPS).⁵⁵

While the strength of the decennial census is that it counts every household in the country, the CPS is a survey that interviews approximately 60,000 households on an annual basis. Since artists are such a small proportion of the overall labor force, a little more than 1 percent, and with writers being only 6 percent of all artists, the accuracy of the CPS estimates as they relate to artists and writers is of concern. What could appear as considerable change in the behavior of writers nationwide might simply be a statistical aberration due to the change in the actions of a single writer in the sample.⁵⁶ Even with these concerns the information from the CPS, especially if it is found to be consistent over a period of time, does provide an important supplement to the census information and confirmation of the behavior identified in surveys of artists and writers that are potentially less representative of the population. Several surveys of this type will be discussed below.

Overall the multiple job holding rate in the U.S., calculated from the CPS, has shown a general upward trend, though it fluctuates with changes in economic conditions. In 1970, the national multiple job holding rate was 5.2 percent. That is, of all those employed at the time of the survey 5.2 percent were multiple job holders. In 1980 the rate had decreased somewhat

⁵⁵Beginning with January 1994, questions about multiple job-holding are now asked on a monthly basis in the CPS.

⁵⁶In the 1991 CPS there were only nine individuals who indicated that their primary occupation was author and that they held a second job. With the weights assigned by the Census to each one of these writers, each represented more than 1,100 individuals.

to 4.9 percent, but in 1989 it had increased to 6.2 percent⁵⁷.

The information from the CPS indicates that multiple job holding is more common among artists than other comparably trained workers. For three recent surveys, 1985, 1989, and 1991, artists' multiple job holding rates were consistently higher than the rates for all the other professional workers. The range is from almost 15 percent higher in 1989, to more than 40 percent higher in 1985. Eliminating those artists whose employment behavior is more like other professional workers' than it is like an artist's (architects, designers, and photographers), then the multiple job holding rate for artists was 13.7 percent in 1991 while for other professional workers it was only 8.2 percent, with the rate for artists sixty-seven percent larger.

Multiple job holding among writers, according to recent CPS data, is quite prevalent. In both 1989 and 1991 writers' multiple job holding rates were approximately 20 percent, indicating that one in five workers who reported being an author as their primary occupation held another job (Table 3-1). With the exception of those artists whose primary occupation is teaching art at the post-secondary level, authors had the highest multiple job holding rate in both 1989 and 1991 of all the artist occupations. It was more than double the rate of all artists and other professionals as well.

Individuals whose primary occupation was that of author and who also had second jobs held jobs in a variety of occupations (Table 3-2). According to the CPS the vast majority of them held jobs in other professional occupations. This is consistent with the high levels of formal education for writers. In both 1989 and 1991 teaching something other than writing at a college or university was the most common second job for writers.

⁵⁷Stinson (1990).

There are several characteristics of writers that seem to be associated with multiple job holding. In 1985 and 1989, writers who held a second job were more likely to be men than writers who did not. The opposite was true in 1991. Perhaps not surprisingly, writers who did hold second jobs were considerably younger than those who did not. This was true across all three surveys. The average differential was about ten years in all three surveys, suggesting that multiple job holding is more common among the new entrants into the writing occupation. This age differential was considerably larger for writers than among all artists where the difference averaged only two years.

The authors occupation is also comprised of individuals whose primary employment is not as a writer, but whose second job is that of a writer. In both 1985 and 1991 approximately one quarter of all those who identified themselves as authors, i.e., it was either their primary or secondary job, had indicated some other job as their primary job. In 1989 the proportion was 40 percent. Not surprisingly, most of those whose second job was being a writer had professional occupations for their primary jobs (Table 3-3). A significant proportion of them held managerial jobs as well.

It is interesting to note that the most common of the artistic occupations to be held as a second job, regardless of the occupation of the primary job, was that of musician. Approximately one third of those holding artistic second jobs worked as musicians. Writers, on the other hand, accounted for only about seven percent of the secondary artistic employment in 1985 and 1991, and almost thirteen percent in 1989.

Those individuals whose primary job is something other than being a writer but whose second occupation is writer are more like those individuals who are writers but have a non-writing second job than those writers who do not have a second job at all. In 1989 and 1991,

these writers were younger than writers without a second job. They also worked more hours in a typical week than those writers without a second job and less than those individuals with a non-writing second job.

A comparison of authors who hold a second job to professional workers who also hold more than one job reveals an interesting difference. In both 1989 and 1991 there was a greater proportion of male writers with multiple jobs than female writers, while the opposite is true for other professional workers. In both those years almost 55 percent of professional multiple job holders were female while in 1991 fewer than 30 percent of the writers with multiple jobs were female. Multiple job holding writers were also somewhat, but not considerably, younger than their multiple job holding professional colleagues.

Non-Census Surveys

Information about authors not drawn on data from national censuses generally come from special studies. These studies fall into three categories. One category includes studies based on general surveys of artists. These are similar to studies based on census data. A broad range of artistic occupations is targeted and the information collected is relevant to all artists. A second category includes studies based on specialized surveys of a single artistic occupation such as authors. These studies include general information relevant for the study of any occupation, and detailed information specifically tailored to that occupation. A third category of studies is based on information provided by artists to a professional organization or union. This information is not from a survey but is information obtained directly from an organization's administrative records.

What follows is an examination of studies of U.S. authors from each category that covers the period 1970 to 1990. It provides a summary of the information they provide on the

economic conditions of authors. An examination will also be undertaken of the strengths and weaknesses of this information in describing the economic behavior of authors relative to the information available through the Census.

First is an examination of two studies based on general artist surveys. Since they were designed to study artists they include information tailored specifically to their experiences, but since they are not a census they may not truly represent the population of artists and are not likely to be as statistically reliable. Also, since the information is from a general survey, detailed information uniquely relevant to authors was not collected. The first will be the Alper-Wassall survey (AW) of artists in New England.⁵⁸ The second will be the Joan Jeffri survey undertaken by Columbia University's Research Center for Arts and Culture⁵⁹ of ten U.S. locations, incorporating eight cities and two non-urban areas (RCAC). Both studies were undertaken in the 1980s.

This will be followed by information from a survey explicitly designed for authors, i.e., an example of the second category of studies. The Kingston-Cole study⁶⁰ was undertaken by Columbia University's Center for the Social Sciences for the Authors Guild Foundation. It is not simply a study of Authors Guild members, but it does draw heavily on the definition of an author established by the Guild. This means that those included in this study were book authors, and that writers who never published a book would not be included. This study while undertaken in the early 1980s refers to the situation of writers in the late 1970s.

The last to be examined is based on information from three Writers Guild of America,

⁵⁸For example see Wassall, Alper, and Davison (1983).

⁵⁹For example see Jeffri (1989).

⁶⁰Kingston and Cole (1986).

west (WGA) studies of writers in Hollywood.⁶¹ Utilizing administrative records, not a survey of its members, the Writers Guild of America, west's reports provide a detailed, but limited description of writers in the motion picture, television, and radio industries. Its limitations are primarily a function the information on its members the WGA maintains on its members and on what the members are required to report to the WGA. One of its strength is that with readily available administrative data several reports covering the ten year period from 1982 through 1991 could be prepared providing a longitudinal study not available from any other source.

A. General Artist Surveys

General surveys of artists which are not part of broader surveys of the general population provide an opportunity to collect information that is idiosyncratic to the artists' work, earnings and other labor market experiences. In general they enable a more narrow definition of artistic occupations than is possible through a general survey of the population, and a more detailed examination of their artistic activities. They provide more detail about the artists' work experiences, education and training, earnings, and non-artistic sources of income. They allow a more detailed analysis of the characteristics and the role of multiple job holding.

General surveys of artists are not likely to be able to obtain information that is idiosyncratic to each artistic occupation. With regard to writers' genre, e.g., fiction, poetry, screen writing, etc., may be an important distinction that is not likely to be made in a general study of artists. In examining sources of writers' income the degree of detail is not likely to distinguish between income received from hardcover book royalties relative to paperback royalties, or free-lance writing for a magazine or newspaper versus writing a script for a television show. The allocation of authors' time among a variety of potential writing activities

⁶¹Bielby and Bielby (1987), (1989), and (1993).

is also not likely to differentiate between writing technical manuals, translations, or fiction.

A.1 Alper-Wassall New England Survey

Alper-Wassall surveyed artists in the six New England states in 1981 and 1982.

Authors comprised 12.1 percent of the sample. In comparison authors comprised 4 percent of artists in the 1980 census. Based on a system of self-identification, 62.4 percent of the authors were "writers," 32.0 percent were "poets," and 5.5 percent were "playwrights" and other creative writers.

The information in Table 3-4 highlights the demographic characteristics of the New England authors and provides a comparison between them and other New England artists. Authors are somewhat older than other artists, and better educated with the proportion holding doctorates more than three times higher than for all artists. Unlike their colleagues in the performing arts and visual arts, authors were not likely to attend specialized arts schools at any level of education (see Table 3-5). In fact, compared to their peers in the arts they were relatively unlikely even to major in their artistic field through their undergraduate education. With regard to graduate degrees, authors are just as likely as visual artists to major in their artistic field, but less likely than performers.

With regard to several other demographic characteristics authors do not dramatically differ from other New England artists. This is true for marital status and racial distribution. One difference is the proportion of women. Authors are unlike performing artists but more like visual artists with slightly more than half the authors being female.

It is through surveys tailored toward artists that the uniqueness of their labor market and earnings experiences are best analyzed. Alper-Wassall identified three separate labor markets that authors, and all artists, were likely to participate in. One was the market for their

art work, i.e., the authors' writing. A second one was working in a job related to the arts, including teaching their art and arts administration. The third was working in a job completely unrelated to the production of their art work, e.g., the proverbial taxi driver or waiter.

Every author in the study spent some time during the year writing, but relatively few, about one in five, were full-time writers (see Table 3-6). This is about the same proportion of full-time artists as the performers, but smaller than for visual artists. Authors averaged approximately 33 weeks throughout the year working as authors, which is about the same as the amount of time spent by the other artists in the production of their art.

Most authors, a little over 50 percent, worked in jobs related to their work as writers as well. Authors were slightly more likely to work in a related job than visual artists, but considerably less likely to do so than performers. The types of jobs held by authors varied, but most who held arts related jobs, almost 90 percent, were employed at other professional jobs (see Table 3-7). Like their artistic peers, most authors with arts related jobs (almost 75 percent) were involved in teaching their art at some level.

Authors also were employed in jobs that were unrelated to their writing. In fact they were more likely than either performing or visual artists to hold jobs not directly related to their artistic work. Almost 45 percent of the authors in this survey held a job unrelated to their writing. The occupational distribution of the unrelated jobs was not as concentrated as the writing related jobs. While the non-teaching professional occupations were the ones most commonly held by writers, only one-quarter of those who held unrelated jobs were in these occupations. The proportion who held teaching jobs not related to their writing (approximately 15 percent) was considerably less than the proportion that held writing related teaching jobs. With regard to the "waiting tables," food service type jobs, authors were less likely to have

been employed in one of these types of jobs (approximately 10 percent) than their artistic peers (approximately 15 percent).

Like many of their artistic colleagues, authors not only worked at a variety of related and unrelated jobs throughout the year they often did several of them at the same time. They are what economists call multiple job holders. The evidence for this can be found in Table 3-6 by examining the number of weeks authors work. The sum of the average number of weeks worked (approximately 65) is more than the number of weeks in a year. In fact authors spend approximately the same number of weeks working as writers as they do in work related to writing and unrelated work combined.

Authors, like other artists, experience periods of unemployment throughout a given year. Alper-Wassall found that one in five authors were unemployed at some time during the year. This is the same as the proportion for all the New England artists. The average author who was unemployed had seven periods of unemployment. This covered a period of 13 weeks of unemployment, or one quarter of the year. The authors' unemployment experience was very similar to the other artists.

The authors' employment experiences are reflected in their earnings and total income, though somewhat differently than the other New England artists. Authors' total income, which includes earnings from the three types of work they participated in and non-labor income from sources such as rent, interest and dividends, was \$17,126 (in 1981 dollars). This was approximately 10 percent higher than the average income for all New England artists (see Table 3-8). From the 1980 Census authors' income was \$15,129 (in 1979 dollars) and it was almost 20 percent higher than the average income for all artists.

Authors' gross earnings from writing were considerably lower than the artistic earnings

of the performing and visual artists. On the other hand, authors' earnings from work related to their writing and non-writing related work was higher than for the other New England artists. The result was that authors' earnings were more balanced between the three types of labor market activities that they participated in than either performers' or visual artists' earnings. The authors' total labor earnings average almost \$14,800. This was higher than the earnings of all New England artists and visual artists, but lower than the earnings of performing artists. While the data is not available from this study for confirmation, it appears that writers earn more on an hourly basis from their work in writing related and non-writing related activities than they do writing since they average less than half the time (in weeks) working at these jobs.

A shortcoming of this study, because it was a general survey of artists rather than one specifically tailored to authors, is that it is not clear where authors would have included any royalty income they might have received. It may be listed in earnings from "work as an artist," or it may be included in income from "non-labor income sources."

Authors, like most artists, incur significant costs in order to produce their writing. New England's authors incurred costs of about \$2,000 in 1981, which was about half the costs incurred by all artists in the region. The impact on their earnings from writing is that authors' earnings net of costs are slightly more than half their gross earnings. This is somewhat worse than for performing artists, but considerably better than visual artists whose earnings net of costs are 30 percent of their gross earnings.

Annual earnings tend to mask differences in work effort and the rate at which the individual is compensated for working. An hourly wage rate controls for the time aspect of work effort and concentrates on the compensation rate. The hourly wage rate for the time

authors spent writing was estimated to be \$2.62. The federally legislated minimum wage in 1981 was \$3.35, suggesting that New England authors earned less than 80 percent of the minimum wage. The authors' estimated wage rate from the 1980 Census was almost \$13, but it reflects earnings from all the jobs held and not simply from working as a writer. In comparison to other artists in New England, authors had the lowest rate of pay for producing their art (see Table 3-9). In fact the rate of pay for performers was almost three times that of authors.

Information enabling the calculation of hourly rates of pay for authors in their non-writing activities was not available. Weekly earnings, which clearly do not correct for differences in the hours worked per week, provide a different picture than what was observed regarding wages from writing. Authors were above average with regard to weekly earnings from work related to their writing and for work not related to their writing. In fact they earned more per week working in a job related to their writing than either performers or visual artists earned from jobs related to their art form and the \$98 per week earned from their non-writing related work was the most received from that activity by any of the artist groups.

Authors participation in the labor market generates income from a number of sources, as we have already seen. Authors can earn income from writing as an employee, such as a screen writer working for a television production company, as a self-employed writer who produces a novel which needs to be sold to a publisher, or as a free-lance writer who contracts with a magazine for a single piece of writing. However the author works, s/he must learn about employment and writing opportunities, or must know how to market his/her work. The most commonly used method by writers to find a writing job was through friends and relatives (see Table 3-10), more than half the authors used this method of job search.

Networking through former business associates was a method utilized by almost half the authors in searching for a job.

Authors who produce books or some other written work, not under contract to a publisher, need to market it to publishers in order to receive income. The most commonly used marketing method for the self-employed, free-lance writer was the agent. Approximately half the writers surveyed indicated they used an agent to market their work.

The analysis of census data suggested that authors are not a homogeneous group. The Alper-Wassall data for 1981 is consistent with this observation. This data only permits an analysis of gender differences rather than the more detailed racial and ethnic differences that can be obtained from the Census.

The information in Table 3-11 highlights some demographic differences between male and female authors and their artistic colleagues. Unlike all artists in New England, male and female writers were essentially the same age, with female writers being older than either female performers or visual artists. Female writers had less formal education than their male colleagues, but more schooling than other female artists by almost one-half a year. The major difference in schooling comes at the graduate level, where male writers were more than twice as likely to have a doctoral degree than female writers. Female writers in the Census were a bit younger than their male colleagues, but they too had slightly less education (see Table 2-13).

With regard to other demographic characteristics, female and male writers were not that different. The proportion married or living with someone with whom they shared income and living expenses was essentially the same, though slightly lower for the female writers. The proportion of female writers who were members of a minority group was the same as the

proportion of men (3.5 percent for women writers and 3.4 percent for male writers). Minorities were under represented among both the male and female writers relative to their representation among all artists, with a greater disparity between male writers and all male artists than among female writers and all female artists. In the Census female writers were a little more likely to be part of a racial or ethnic minority than male writers, and slightly less likely to be married.

Gender differences can be more widely found in an examination of the labor market characteristics and the earnings of writers. In general, women writers did not do as well in the labor market, whether it was the market for their writing or any other market in which they might have participated (Table 3-12), or worked as much. Women writers were more likely to be unemployed during the year than their male colleagues, also found to be true in the Census, and more likely to have held a job related to their writing.

Female writers were half as likely to have been full-time writers than their male colleagues while female artists overall were about 70 percent as likely to have been full-time artists. Female writers worked less than their male colleagues. They worked fewer hours per week as writers (approximately 10 percent less) and fewer weeks per year (almost 20 percent fewer). With respect to non-writing labor market activities, female writers worked fewer weeks than their male colleagues. These differences were true for all artists, but generally not as large as they are for writers. Much of this was also the case with Census writers. The female writers were less likely to work full-time, though not quite as much less, they worked fewer hours per week, and fewer weeks per year in all labor market activities (see Table 2-19).

Many gender differences in time spent in the labor market were reflected in differences in earnings (see Tables 3-13 to 3-16). Women authors earned about 18 percent of what male

writers earned from writing on an annual basis. When adjusting for the time spent working as a writer the difference narrows but it does not disappear. On a weekly basis women writers earned approximately 22 percent of their male colleagues' earnings, and on an hourly basis they received approximately 42 percent of what their male colleagues' earned. Compared to their peers in other artistic disciplines, female writers ranked lowest relative to their male colleagues. Female performers earned 53 percent of what their male colleagues earned on an hourly basis, and female visual artists' earnings were almost 70 percent of their male colleagues.

With regard to other sources of labor market earnings, female writers fared better. Women writers earned almost 60 percent of what their male colleagues earned on an annual basis from writing related work, and after adjusting for the number of weeks worked at these jobs the differential was reduced to 78 percent. The differences in earnings from all other types of labor market activity were very similar; female writers' annual earnings were 71 percent of their male colleagues and their weekly earnings were 76 percent. Overall, though, the female writers' annual earnings from all sources were half their male colleagues, which is essentially what was found for the relative earnings of female performers and visual artists and what was found for authors in the Census. With regard to weekly total earnings female writers earned approximately 6 percent more than the average for all artists. They earned 63 percent of what male writers earned.

There was one source of income in which female writers had an advantage over their male colleagues, non-labor income. Female writers received 16 percent more than their male colleagues from things such as royalties, interest and dividends, alimony, Social Security, and other income transfers. This advantage helped increase the total income of female writers

relative to male writers to the point where the female writers' income was 60 percent of the male income. Female authors in the Census did not have an advantage over their male colleagues relative to asset income, so that the difference between female and male total income was still about 50 percent.

The difference in female writers' performance in the labor market did not affect the overall economic circumstances of their households relative to the households in which there was a male writer. Female writers' household income was only slightly lower than male writers' household income, the differential was only 3 percent or about \$900 in 1981. Female writers were members of households with higher average household income than their female colleagues in the other arts disciplines. This difference was about 10 percent. This might reflect the difference in age discussed above. In the Census, the female authors' households' income was slightly higher than their male colleagues, the difference was about 7 percent (see Table 2-25).

Female writers who held other jobs found themselves in different jobs than their male colleagues (see Table 3-17). While the vast majority of both male and female writers who held writing related jobs taught at some level, a larger proportion of male writers taught at the college level. The differential was about 50 percent. An even greater differential existed in the likelihood of working in managerial and executive jobs. Male writers were seven times more likely to have held a writing related job in one of these occupations than a female writer. Women writers were more likely to have worked in non-teaching professional jobs than their male colleagues. They were also more likely to be teaching at the primary and secondary school level than men, which is consistent with the distribution in the general population.

There were also differences in the types of non-writing related jobs held. Again,

women writers were more likely to have worked in a non-teaching professional job than male writers. Teaching in non-writing related fields was much less likely for both men and women than teaching in writing related ones. Men were more likely than women to have taught at the primary and secondary level, while they were equally likely to have taught at the college level. The major difference that did exist in the types of jobs they held was in the proportion of men and women writers who held clerical and operative and laborer jobs. Female writers were about seven times more likely to have held a clerical job than male writers, while male writers were about five times more likely to hold an operative and laborer job. This pattern is again consistent with what was observed in the general population.

A.2 Columbia University's Research Center for Arts and Culture Survey

Columbia University's Research Center for Arts and Culture (RCAC) also undertook a general survey of artists.⁶² Unlike the Alper-Wassall survey, it was undertaken with a particular focus: to examine the work-related human and social service needs of artists. Undertaken in 1989, it was a mail survey of artists, not simply authors, in eight large metropolitan areas across the country and two regions of Massachusetts.⁶³

As with any non-census study of artists it is subject to concerns regarding its ability to represent the population, reliability, and its ability to obtain the detailed information regarding any particular group of artists, like writers. Like the Alper-Wassall study, it provides some valuable insights into the economic condition of authors and, given the similarities in its findings to other studies, it becomes part of a useful body of studies that confirms the uniqueness of artists in general, and authors in particular.

⁶²Jeffri (1989).

⁶³The cities were: Boston, Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, St. Paul, New York City, Philadelphia, and San Francisco; the two Massachusetts regions were: Cape Cod and Western Massachusetts.

The authors in this study are very much like those in the Alper-Wassall study. This was especially true with regard to their demographic characteristics and their educational background. They were very highly educated, especially those who identified their first choice for their "major area of concentration" as "writing/literature" (see Table 3-18). More than one-third had completed their schooling with bachelors degrees, and more than half had graduate degrees. These figures are very close to what Alper-Wassall found, but somewhat different than what the 1990 Census shows. In 1990, 43 percent of the authors had bachelor's degrees, and only 30 percent had graduate degrees (see Table 2-14) . The age at which the RCAC authors started their training, 16.4 years, which is relatively old compared to other artists, is almost identical to Alper-Wassall.

There are some differences among the authors' demographic characteristics in the RCAC study and Alper-Wassall. The RCAC authors are somewhat younger, more likely to be women, and more racially and ethnically diverse than the both the Alper-Wassall and the Census authors (see Table 3-18 and Table 2-14). These differences may reflect changes that occurred during the 1980s in the overall labor force; differences in the questions asked and the categorization of the authors' responses; or differences in the geographic distribution of the authors studied. The RCAC sampled authors in major metropolitan areas from across the country while the Alper-Wassall study was limited to authors in the six state New England region.

Information concerning the education of RCAC authors provides additional evidence on the diversity of the educational experiences they utilized to develop their skills (see Table 3-19). Most interesting is that the vast majority, 80 percent, indicated that they were, at least in part, "self-taught" writers. More than 40 percent of the authors prepared for their writing

careers through the use of private teachers and/or mentors.⁶⁴

The picture of the labor market experiences of the RCAC authors, while not always directly comparable to the Alper-Wassall authors, is very similar. In a year when the national unemployment rate was at its lowest level in about a decade, the RCAC authors' unemployment rate (see Table 3-20) was almost double the national rate. This was also true among the Alper-Wassall authors earlier in the same decade, but even more so. The Census found an unemployment rate for authors that was considerably lower than the national rate and very much at odds with the RCAC findings.

Almost 90 percent of the writers indicated the need to work at some non-writing job to support their writing, and nearly half the authors were multiple job holders at the time of the survey. Many of them were working more than full-time with regard to the number of hours they worked per week. With almost half indicating they worked more than 20 hours per week writing or in some other writing related activity, and almost 70 percent indicating they worked more than 20 hours per week in a non-writing related job, a significant proportion are working more than a standard 40 hour week.

The authors' labor market experiences lead to income generated from a variety of sources. The RCAC study obtained information on authors' income from working as a writer or in some other artistic endeavor, income from grants and/or awards, income from royalties, and income from unemployment insurance. The majority of the authors received no income from either grants or awards, royalties, or unemployment compensation (see Table 3-21).

When looking only at income earned from writing or some other writing or arts related activity, barely half the authors earned more than \$500 (1988 dollars). An estimate of the

⁶⁴Multiple responses were permitted to this question and some others in this survey.

average authors' earnings⁶⁵ is over \$4,600. This is only 10 percent more than what Alper-Wassall estimated for earnings simply from writing about seven years earlier. The income received by the authors from this work was enough to cover the expenses associated with producing their "artistic" work for 43 percent of the writers. The majority did not earn enough from their writing or related work to cover their "artistic" expenses.

The authors' total income, regardless of source, suggests that the earnings from work unrelated to writing plays a very important role in determining their economic well-being. Almost half the RCAC writers had total income greater than \$20,000. A rough estimate of the writers' average income using the same estimating technique discussed above is almost \$21,700. This would suggest that, on average, almost \$17,000 of their income comes from a combination of the work that is not related to their writing or some other artistic activity, and from non-labor income sources. This total income figure is almost 25 percent greater than Alper-Wassall's estimate for writers' total income but it is considerably less than the almost \$31,000 (1989 dollars) average income for Census authors (see Table 2-23).

B. Special Artist Surveys

The number of studies based on surveys of a single artistic occupation are relatively few.⁶⁶ That is what makes the Columbia Survey of American Authors,⁶⁷ sponsored by the Authors' Guild Foundation, so unique. As a special survey it is not only designed to identify information that describes authors' experiences and economic conditions that could be found

⁶⁵The data collected was in seven earnings categories, with the last being open ended; the estimate was based on the midpoints of each category, except for the last when actual values were used when available.

⁶⁶For example see Netzer and Parker (1993); and referenced in Kingston and Cole is a study of PEN members undertaken by Philippe B. Perebimnosos for PEN (Kingston and Cole, *op. cit.*, 31).

⁶⁷Kingston and Cole, *op. cit.*

in any labor market survey, but also to obtain information that is idiosyncratic to the authors. In this study a distinction is made with respect to writing genre. Separate information is reported for writers of children's books, adult fiction, and adult nonfiction, for example. Also, more author relevant information is collected on sources of income. Distinctions are made between royalties from hardcover books, paperback books that were the original edition, and paperback books that were reprints from a hardcover edition.

The Columbia Survey of American Authors (CSAA) surveyed almost five thousand writers in 1980. The researchers attempted not to limit the definition of the population of authors by establishing it to be "all contemporary American writers who have had at least one book published."⁶⁸ They did, though, obtain the sample from two somewhat unique, and perhaps not representative, lists of authors. Approximately 60 percent of those sampled were from the Authors Guild's membership list. The remaining 40 percent were from a list of authors who had been invited to join the Guild but had turned down the invitation. So, in fact, this was not a survey of all writers, but it only included writers as defined by the Authors Guild's membership criteria. In doing so the researchers limited those surveyed to writers with at least one book published in the last seven years, three works of fiction or non-fiction published by a magazine in the last eighteen months, or a writer whose professional reputation entitles him/her to membership according to the Membership Committee.⁶⁹ Clearly, then, this study excluded academic writers, screen writers, and perhaps most importantly, writers who were new entrants to the market but who had not yet gained the success of having published a book or had a sufficient number of articles published to meet the membership

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 25-26.

criteria.

The findings from the Columbia survey are, in general, consistent with the findings from the two studies already discussed. The differences reflect not only the specificity of the information obtained from the authors, but the differences in the samples.

The demographic characteristics of the CSAA authors highlights both the similarities and the differences. The CSAA survey identified 40 percent of authors as being women. This is 20 percent less than what the Census found in 1980 and what Alper-Wassall found only two years later, and it is two-thirds of what was found in the RCAC study almost a decade later. Certainly this could suggest that the proportion of women authors has grown, which would be consistent with what census data suggests, or it is simply an artifact of the different samples. CSAA authors were well educated relative to the general population and professional workers. The median author had completed a college degree ⁷⁰ and the median author finished "almost 16"⁷¹ years of school. This is consistent with the other surveys and the Census, though a slightly lower level of achievement. The CSAA authors were predominantly white, with only 3 percent non-whites, which is in line with Alper-Wassall, but a bit lower than the Census and RCAC. Approximately two-thirds were married, again more in line with AW than RCAC and the Census.

Like the previous studies, CSAA found that the vast majority of authors earned income from work other than free-lance writing. Fully 70 percent of the authors had labor earnings from work other than their work as a writer.⁷² Almost half the authors (46 percent) held

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 101.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 48.

regular salaried positions other than as a writer⁷³ and 40 percent of those who did not hold regular non-writing positions worked irregularly doing things related to their writing such as editing, translating and lecturing.⁷⁴ The types of non-writing jobs held by the authors were consistent with their high level of educational attainment (see Table 3-22).⁷⁵ Approximately 40 percent held non-teaching professional jobs, and an equal proportion held teaching jobs, most of them at colleges and universities (90 percent). Only a very small proportion, less than 10 percent, held the stereotypical sales, clerical or service job of the "starving artist."

The work experience of the authors in the CSAA survey led to earnings and income patterns that parallel other surveys of writers and other artists. If the writers were required to live only on their earnings from writing, the majority of writers in the CSAA survey would have been in poverty. It was the non-writing work activity and the income of the writers' spouse/spouse equivalents that provided them with total family income comparable to, if not better than, most professional workers.

The typical (i.e., median) free-lance writer earned \$4,775 (1979 dollars) from writing.⁷⁶ Approximately 10 percent of the free-lance writers actually earned no income from "writing-related" activities and one-quarter earned less than \$1,000. At the upper end of the distribution, the top 10 percent of writers earned \$45,000 or more, and the top 5 percent earned more than \$80,000 from writing. The rate of compensation for writing related work, after controlling for the amount of time spent, was \$4.90 per hour, this was less than the median hourly wage estimated from the Census by about 10 percent.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 45.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 47.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 49.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 57.

These estimated earnings from free-lance writing are considerably higher than what either AW or RCAC reported, especially when adjusted for inflation. AW reported median "arts earnings" for authors to be \$191 (1981 dollars) and RCAC reported a median less than \$3,000 (1988 dollars). AW also reported an estimated average hourly compensation rate for authors' "art work", i.e. writing, of \$2.62, which is considerably less than CSAA's estimate.

There are a number of potential explanations for such large differentials, one of which is simply what was included in CSAA's definition of writing-related income. CSAA included in its definition income from: royalties and subsidiary rights from books; fees for free-lance magazine and newspaper articles; and payments for radio, television and movie scripts. Excluded was any earnings from salaried writing employment and free-lance activities such as editing, translating and lecturing. An additional explanation for the apparent disparity in estimates probably comes from the sample used by CSAA. Every author in this survey had to have a modicum of success to have been either on the Authors Guild's membership list or on the list of those who refused the invitation to join the Guild. This would have eliminated any new writer from the sample of writers surveyed. New writers were not excluded from either AW or RCAC. Additionally, the majority (55 percent) of the CSAA writers lived in the northeast, a region of the country with relatively high wages for all workers.

CSAA's estimates for the authors' total income and family income are also higher than either AW's or RCAC's estimates. What makes them consistent with the findings of the other studies is that relative to the estimated earnings from writing (using a somewhat broader definition than discussed above), the estimated \$27,000 for the authors' median personal income⁷⁷ is only slightly higher than what one might expect. In general the CSAA authors'

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, 99.

writing-related income was somewhat less than half their personal income,⁷⁸ while AW found it to be slightly more than half. In comparison to the Census, the CSAA median is almost three times larger perhaps reflective of the prior success of the authors in the CSAA sample.

Family income for the typical CSAA author was \$38,000.⁷⁹ This reflects considerable work effort on the part of each author's spouse. Eighty percent of married authors, or 50 percent of all the authors, had a working spouse. The contribution of the typical writer's husband to the household's income was approximately \$26,000, and the contribution of the typical writer's wife was approximately \$4,000.⁸⁰ The 50 percent differential between CSAA's estimate for authors' family income and AW's estimate, and the smaller but significant differential (33 percent) between it and the Census, are likely to be related to differences in definitions of income and in the sample, as discussed above.

As a survey specifically designed for authors, the CSAA study provides unique insights into the writing-related earnings of authors that cannot be ascertained from either the Census or general surveys of artists that include writers in their samples. One factor that was found to be correlated with writing-related income that would not be available in a more general survey was the author's writing genre.⁸¹ While it was the case that approximately 45 percent of all writers earned less than \$5,000 from writing books, there was considerable variability in income from book writing by genre. Poets earned the least from books. Approximately 60 percent of the poets earned less than \$2,500, and almost three-quarters earned less than \$5,000. Authors of "academically oriented nonfiction" were only slightly better off with almost

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 102.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 102.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 105.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, Table 4.7, 85.

70 percent having earned less than \$5,000. Writers of genre fiction, i.e., westerns, thrillers, science fiction, etc., were at the other end of the distribution. Almost one-quarter of them earned in excess of \$50,000 from their writing while approximately the same proportion earned less than \$5,000. By comparison, only 15 percent of writers of general adult fiction, and 7 percent of children's books writers earned in excess of \$50,000.

Several other factors, besides writing genre, were examined as potential correlates of writing income.⁸² One identified as suggesting a "non-trivial difference" was the author's gender. Median earnings for female writers from writing was 77 percent of median earnings for male writers (\$4,000 vs \$5,200). In the context of relative female earnings for the entire U.S. work force, female writers were better off than female workers in general since the overall female to male earnings ratio was 60 percent. The difference in earnings apparently was not at the extremes of the earnings distribution, approximately the same proportion of men and women earned less than \$2,500 or more than \$50,000 from writing. For "committed full-time" writers writing genre was important in helping to explain the gender differential. Women were almost three times as likely to write children's books, which are not likely to generate as much income as other books, than men.

There were several factors that are generally found to be correlated with an individual's income that were not found to be important correlates of writing-related income in the CSAA study. Included in this category was the occupation and education of the author's father, the author's race or ethnicity, the author's level of educational attainment, and the prestige of the educational institution attended. Some of these outcomes are unique to this study, especially the one suggesting that race is not an important correlate. This again could be explained by

⁸² *Ibid.*, 72-76.

having sampled only from successful writers. The result concerning educational attainment is consistent with other studies in which artists' earnings can be differentiated by source, e.g. writing-related earnings and earnings from other types of work. This includes research by Alper and Wassall using their data for New England.⁸³

A unique aspect of the CSAA study was that information was collected on more than one year's income enabling a limited, but important, analysis of the stability in authors' writing income. At the extremes of the income distribution there was a great deal of stability.⁸⁴ More than 80 percent of the writers earning less than \$2,500 in 1978 from their writing did so in 1979. Moreover, half those who did improve earned between \$2,500 and \$4,999, indicating only slight improvement in their position in the earnings distribution. At the other extreme, almost 90 percent of the writers who earned \$100,000 or more in 1978 did so in 1979, and of those who did change half were still earning between \$50,000 and \$99,999. Authors whose writing income was between these two extremes showed a great deal more change in their earnings. Fewer than half the writers with 1978 writing incomes between \$2,500 and \$19,999 remained in the same income group in 1979. Approximately 60 percent of writers with incomes in the range of \$20,000 to \$99,999 were in the same income category in both 1978 and 1979.

C. Administrative Records

Authors and writers belong to a variety of professional organizations, including PEN and the Authors Guild, but very few of these organizations have any need to regularly collect information on the employment or earnings of its members. Very irregularly they may survey

⁸³See Wassall and Alper (1984).

⁸⁴Kingston and Cole, *op. cit.*, Table 4.1, 62.

their members, as we have seen with the Authors Guild's study discussed above.

The situation is quite different for the writers' unions. They have a considerable need to regularly obtain employment and earnings information from their members. Since many writers are independent contractors rather than employees in a traditional employer-employee relationship, the only way their unions can ensure that they are being compensated in accordance with the negotiated rates is for the members to report their employment activity. It is also important in establishing employers' contributions to the unions' health and welfare funds.

Two of the largest unions for writers are the Writers Guild of America and the Dramatists Guild. Both of which, along with the Authors Guild, have their roots in the Authors League of America which was founded in 1912. The Writers Guild of America (WGA) is the only true writers' union because it is recognized by the National Labor Relations Board. This is because it represents writers who are employees rather than writers who are independent contractors or who lease their copyrighted material to others. The WGA organizes writers, bargains with the production companies, networks, etc., and administers agreements, in the television, radio and movie industries. There are in fact two affiliated unions that make up the WGA: the WGA, East and the WGA, west. The Mississippi River divides the membership.

The WGA, west, the larger of the two WGA unions, has been very active since the mid-1980s in studying the employment experiences of its members. In that period it has produced three reports on the employment conditions of its members.⁸⁵ These reports are derived from the WGA's administrative records, not from a survey of its members.

The use of administrative records provides these reports with a degree of reliability that

⁸⁵ Bielby and Bielby (1987), (1989), and (1993).

is not available from surveys. The information is not dependent on the memories or records of writers regarding their activities and earnings over a particular time period. Also, there is no problem of response rate as there is with a survey since collecting this information is not intrusive into the authors' lives.

On the other hand, the information in the union's administrative records probably does not provide a complete picture of the labor market experiences of its members. This is especially true for those writers who are not currently employed or who were employed part-time during the year as writers in the television, movie or radio industries. Other sources of labor earnings, whether from some other form of writing or not, are not included in the WGA records. Nor is any income from non-labor sources, such as unemployment benefits, welfare, or rent, or from other family members. These sources have been identified as important for many writers in the studies previously discussed.

New entrants into the occupation, who have not yet obtained their first regular job in the industry, are not likely to be included. One reason is that there is a non-trivial initiation fee (e.g., the WGA, East's fee is \$1,000). Newly employed writers who have not worked enough to be admitted to the union clearly are not included either.

The information contained in the union's records does not include a great deal of background information. Information relative to the writers' education, training, socioeconomic background, and other elements of their lives that are relevant to a complete understanding of their economic condition simply is not available.

Even with these shortcomings, the information in the three reports provides an interesting picture of the earnings and employment experiences of the writers in the television, film and radio industries. It is a picture that is not inconsistent with what has already been

discussed, even though it is somewhat restricted in scope due to the data limitations.

Like the three reports written by Bielby and Bielby, the primary focus here will be on the employment and earnings experiences of women, minorities and "older" writers. It is, though, important to place this detail into the context of the broader changes that have occurred in the employment and earnings experiences of the writers who are WGA, west's members.

Employment of writers in the television, film and radio industries grew considerably from 1982 to 1991. Total employment grew by more than 30 percent, to almost 3,700 writers.⁸⁶ The supply of writers willing to work in these industries apparently grew at a rate faster than the growth in the number of jobs over this period. In 1985, 54 percent of the WGA, west members were employed in jobs covered by the union's Minimum Basic Agreements (MBA) for at least one quarter during the year.⁸⁷ In 1991 this percentage had decreased to 48 percent.⁸⁸ Had the supply grown at the same pace as jobs, then the percentage employed should have remained constant.

Earnings of writers who were WGA, west members grew considerably over the ten year period from 1982 to 1991. Median earnings (nominal) for the writers who were employed grew almost 117 percent. Median earnings in 1982 were \$26,100⁸⁹ while in 1991 they were \$56,619.⁹⁰ Over the decade covered by the 1980 and 1990 censuses, authors' median earnings grew by 160 percent, from \$5,005 in 1979 to \$13,000 in 1989.

Earnings growth was not equally shared by all writers. The top earning writers, those in

⁸⁶Bielby and Bielby (1989), appendix Table 2, and Bielby and Bielby (1993), Table 2.

⁸⁷Bielby and Bielby (1987), Table 2.

⁸⁸Bielby and Bielby (1993), 12.

⁸⁹Bielby and Bielby (1987), Table 3b.

⁹⁰Bielby and Bielby (1993), Table 2.

the 95th percentile of the earnings distribution, had a growth in earnings for the entire period that was somewhat less than the growth of the overall median. Their earnings grew 96 percent over the entire period. Apparently, this reflected a relatively small increase in earnings for the period 1982 to 1986, because between 1987 and 1991 the earnings of the top 5 percent of these writers grew faster than for the median writer (44 percent versus 29 percent).⁹¹ Further analysis by Bielby and Bielby led them to conclude that "...the gap between the highest paid and lowest paid writers grew in the late 1980s".⁹²

While there has been considerable growth in the female and minority membership of the WGA, west, there has been relatively little change in the distribution of employment. Overall WGA membership grew by 40 percent during the 1986 to 1991 period. Female membership grew by 60 percent and minority membership almost doubled. Changes in employment were not as dramatic, leaving an occupation that is still dominated by white males. In 1982 just over 80 percent of the employed writers were white males. Ten years later the proportion was just over 75 percent.⁹³ The proportion of females employed grew from 19 percent to just over 22 percent. The proportion minority grew from 2 percent to almost 3.5 percent. Older writers, defined by Bielby and Bielby to be writers more than 40 years old, increased in membership by 20 percent over the period, but their 1991 share of employment was exactly the same as their share in 1982, 48 percent.

The differences between WGA, west's male and female members' earnings are similar to the Census and the other studies we have discussed. Throughout the ten year period the

⁹¹Bielby and Bielby (1993), 13.

⁹²*Ibid.*

⁹³Bielby and Bielby (1987), Table 3b, and Bielby and Bielby (1993), Table 2.

median earnings of employed female writers were considerably less than male earnings. The pattern changes slightly over the period, but comparing the beginning of the period to the end of the period shows very little gain for women writers. In 1982, median female earnings were \$21,301, about 73 percent of median male earnings. In the middle of the 1980s the differential actually widened to the point that in 1986 women writers were earning 60 percent of what male writers earned. By the end of the decade female writers' median earnings, which were \$45,995, had recovered to the point that they were earning 75 percent of male writers. It is important to remember that these differences are only in the earnings in writing jobs covered by the MBA and do not include any other writing earnings or earnings from any other job that these writers might have held. The studies do not provide any information on the number of hours worked which would enable the estimation of a wage rate which would perhaps provide a better understanding of why these differences exist. Women authors in the Census did make some gains over the decade, but by 1989 their median earnings were only 45 percent of male earnings, up from 36 percent in 1979.

The evidence with respect to minority writers' relative earnings is quite different. For the WGA's minority writers, the decade from 1982 to 1991 was a period of considerable gain. In 1982 the median earnings of minority writers was \$11,780. This was only 40 percent of the median earnings for non-minority writers. While there were some periods of slippage, the general trend was for an improvement with considerable gains made in the last three years of the period. In 1989 minority writers' earnings had grown to where they were 87 percent of the earnings of non-minorities. In 1991 the median earnings for minority writers diminished slightly to 80 percent of the earnings of the non-minority writers. The 1991 median for minority writers was \$48,061. The same caveats exist in comparing minority earnings to non-

minority as do in the male-female comparison, but this is compounded by the relatively small number of minority writers who had any earnings, in 1982 it was only 52. Any change in earnings of a relatively small number of minority writers can have a relatively large impact on these comparisons, even when using median earnings. According to the Census black authors had median earnings that were 13 percent higher than white earnings in 1979 and 31 percent higher in 1989. A pattern that shows greater improvement than the WGA, west.

The WGA, west administrative data provides a great deal of additional detail on characteristics of the employer and the type of job held by writers. The detail is to the level of the particular television show or type of motion picture company they worked for. It identifies the phase of script writing they did; whether they worked on the first draft, did polish work, or wrote the final draft. This degree of detail could not be obtained from a general survey of artists, and would not even be likely in a general survey of writers. It really makes sense for it to only come from administrative records where the information is pertinent to monitoring the contractual agreements that exist between the union on the firms.

The WGA, west data suggests that significant differences exist among members depending on the genre in which they are working and by whom they are employed. Based on the data for the 1987 to 1991 period,⁹⁴ the median earnings for television writers was greater than for film writers. In 1987 the median television writer earned 22 percent more than the median film writer. The difference narrowed considerably over the period so that by 1991 the median writer in television was only earning 3 percent more than the median writer in film (\$49,066 versus \$47,750).

The data also shows that there were actually larger differences within the genres than

⁹⁴Bielby and Bielby (1993), Table 5.

across them. The relevant characteristic appears to be the type of firm that employed the writer. Throughout the entire period of the three WGA studies (1982-1991) the writers who worked for the major film production companies earned more than the writers in any other sector of the film or television industries.⁹⁵ Relative to the writers who worked for the independent film producers (e.g., Orion, and Gaunt Films Ltd.), those who worked for the major producers (e.g., MGM and Paramount) earned 72 percent more in 1982 and 115 percent more in 1991.

In television the pattern was essentially the same. Those writers who worked for the major producers of television shows (e.g., Columbia and Fox) earned considerably more than those who worked for independent producers of television shows (e.g., Carson and Dick Clark). In 1982 they earned 62 percent more, and in 1991 they earned almost double what the writers employed by independent production companies earned. Writers employed by the three television networks also earned considerably less than those who worked for the major production companies.

With regard to earnings, the relative difference between female and male writers also varied within the genres more than it did across them. Women writers' relative earnings showed greater improvement among film writers than television writers. In 1987, the median earnings of female film writers was two-thirds the median earnings of white-male film writers. In 1991 the gap had narrowed to 86 percent of male earnings. In the television industry the 1987 differential ratio was sixty-eight percent, but the gap did not narrow as much so that in 1991 female television writers were earning 77 percent of their male colleagues.

The published data allows a longer perspective for the within industry differences.

⁹⁵Bielby and Bielby (1987), Appendix Table 4, and Bielby and Bielby (1993), Table 5.

Within the film industry there was considerable fluctuation in the earnings of female writers relative to male writers. In 1982, at the beginning of the period, female writers in major film production companies earned 75 percent of what their male colleagues earned. In 1986 the differential had increased to the point that female writers earned only 54 percent of their male colleagues. By 1991 the situation had improved to the point where female film writers were earning 85 percent of what their male colleagues earned. Among the writers in the smaller film production companies there were also fluctuations, but the differential over the entire ten year period did not change very much. In 1982 female earnings were 80 percent of male earnings, and in 1991 they were 78 percent of male earnings.

The television industry was quite different. Female writers working for the major networks made significant gains over the ten year period. In 1982 female writers' earnings were 57 percent of male writers' earnings, but by 1990 and 1991, female writers' earnings were on par with their male colleagues. Similar, though not quite as dramatic, improvements were observed among the female writers working for the major television production companies. In 1982 the female writers working for the majors earned 61 percent of what the male writers earned, by 1991 they were earning 90 percent of what their male colleagues earned.

Some gains were also made in the employment of female writers in both the television and film industries over the ten year period. In the film industry female writers were 17 percent of the writers employed at the major studios in 1982 and 18 percent in 1991.⁹⁶ Among the writers at the independent studios female writers were about 14 percent of the writers in 1982 and 18 percent in 1991. In television production there was also some slight

⁹⁶Bielby and Bielby (1989), Appendix Table 3 and Bielby and Bielby (1993), Table 4.

improvement. Female writers comprised about 24 percent of the employment among the networks in 1982 and about 27 percent in 1991. One of the largest gains in female employment was among the major television production companies where they comprised almost 19 percent of the employment in 1982 and 23 percent in 1991.

Identifying trends in earnings or employment for minority writers is even more difficult because it is confounded by a relatively small number of them having been employed at all. Small absolute changes, but significant changes in relative terms, can have a considerable impact on aggregate data even when utilizing medians. For example, in 1987 minority writers working at the major film production companies earned 40 percent of their white male colleagues' earnings. One year later they apparently earned 135 percent more. How could this occur? The employment data provides a reasonable explanation. In 1987, according to the WGA, there were thirteen minority writers who were employed for at least one quarter during the year in the industry, in 1988 there were only five.

Considerable employment gains have been made by minority writers in both the television and film industries. Over the ten year period minority employment in the major television production companies increased from 2.3 percent of total employment to 4.4 percent. Even larger gains were made at the networks with minority representation among the writers increasing from 1.0 percent to 4.6 percent. In absolute terms, minority employment at the networks in 1991 was sixteen writers, up from three in 1982. Similar gains were made in the film production industry. Minority employment at the major studios increased from 1.0 percent to 3.2 percent. While at the independent studios employment increased for minority writers from 1.0 percent to 2.2 percent. Again, the total number of writers working in the movie industry in 1991 was only fifty, up from eleven in 1982.

The earnings of minority writers in the film and television industries relative to their white-male colleagues showed a great deal of volatility over the period, but a general upward trend. In 1982 minority writers employed by the networks earned 55 percent of what the white-male writers earned. By 1991 they were earning almost 70 percent of their white male colleagues. At the major television producers they fared considerably better. In 1982 median minority earnings were 57 percent of median white-male earnings, but by 1991 they had risen to 93 percent of their colleagues'. The changes in relative earnings in the film industry were similar. In 1984 minority writers' median earnings at the major film studios were 25 percent of the white-male median, while in 1991 they were two-thirds of their white-male colleagues. Again, the gains for minority writers were greater among the independent film producers where in 1982 they had median earnings that were one-third of their white-male colleagues, but in 1991 they were 18 percent larger.

Studies of Writers in Other Countries

International comparisons of authors are a difficult undertaking. While many countries regularly produce a census count of their population, relatively few obtain detailed information on the earnings and labor market experiences of the population comparable to that collected in the United States. Even in those countries where detailed information is collected, such as Australia and Canada, the definitions used to classify people as authors and artists differ from those used in the U.S. For example, the Australians include journalists among the arts occupations while the Canadians and the U.S. do not.

For some countries in which the census does not provide a richness of information, surveys of authors and other artists are the only source of information. Like the surveys undertaken in the U.S., some are general surveys of artists in which authors are included as

part of the broader occupational group being surveyed. The information collected is not specific to the authors' unique experiences. Towse's recent study of artists in Wales⁹⁷ is an example of this type of work.

Very few countries specifically survey authors. Recent examples have been undertaken in Finland⁹⁸ and France.⁹⁹ Like specialized surveys in this country, these too are often subject to limitations that affect their usefulness in providing a true picture of all writers. For example, the study of Finnish writers includes "literary writers" only, excluding writers in the film and television industries. The study of French authors was not as restrictive in the types of writers, but was limited to "professional authors" whose incomes were greater than "1,200 times the hourly minimum indexed interprofessional wage rate"¹⁰⁰ and who belonged to either of two social security agencies established for French authors.

Similar to the U.S. experience described above, organizations of professional writers in other countries sometimes study the economic condition of their members. In the early 1980s the Society of Authors in England undertook a study of its members along with the members of the Writers' Guild.¹⁰¹ Like their counterparts in the U.S., studies of this sort are of limited value in that they tend to represent a very limited subset of the overall population of authors. The scope of the information collected is often limited to meet the needs of the organization and therefore generally does not provide a very comprehensive picture of the economic conditions of their membership.

⁹⁷Towse (n.d.) "The Economic and Social Characteristics of Artists in Wales."

⁹⁸Heikkinen (1989a).

⁹⁹Vessilier-Ressi (1994).

¹⁰⁰*Ibid.*, 166.

¹⁰¹Findlater (1982).

The information that can be obtained from other countries suggests that even with the differences that exist among the countries, there are similarities between their writers and writers in the U.S. Information from Australia's 1986 census¹⁰² is suggestive of some of the differences and similarities found, as is information from Canada's census.¹⁰³

A. Australia

Australian writers comprise a very small portion of the total Australian work force. In 1986 they were .03 percent of total employment, while in the U.S. authors are .09 percent of the labor force. The relative share of artists who are authors is comparable to the U.S., Australian writers are 5.2 percent of all artists; in the U.S. they are 6.4 percent. Like U.S. writers, the majority are male, though the proportion female is similar to the U.S., 47.9 percent female in Australia compared to 49.5 percent in the U.S. Relative to other workers in Australia, writers are very well educated. Approximately 44 percent of the authors earned a "degree," the highest level of educational qualification reported in the census. In comparison, less than 8 percent of the Australian work force had earned a "degree."

The median annual income of the Australian authors was higher than the median for all workers. In Australia the authors' median income was 20 percent higher. Female writers in Australia had higher income relative to their male colleagues than female writers in the U.S. In the U.S. 1990 median female writers' income was 52 percent of their male colleagues', while in Australia in 1986 the female writers earned almost 80 percent of their male colleagues'. Female writers' income relative to male writers was in fact higher than female

¹⁰² *The Arts: Some Australian Data, Fourth Edition* (1991).

¹⁰³ *A Canadian Dictionary & Selected Statistical Profile of Arts Employment, 1981* (1984), and *The Nation: Occupation, Ottawa: Statistics Canada* (1993); and *The Nation: Employment Income by Occupation* (1993).

relative earnings for all workers in Australia.

Earnings for writers in Australia also differed by the industry in which they were employed. Writers working in the television industry had the highest average income followed by writers in the movie industry. Writers in radio had the fourth highest earnings. This is consistent with the information in the WGA, west reports of U.S. writers in comparable industries. Australian writers in the publishing industry had the third highest average incomes, with those in the creative arts industry and theater being fifth and sixth, respectively.

B. Canada

Canada, like the U.S., undertakes a census of its population on a regular basis, but every five years. The Canadian data is from censuses that cover the period 1971 to 1991. The official Canadian definition of writers used in their published documents combines writers with editors, unlike the U.S., making direct comparisons difficult.

The number of Canadian writers has grown considerably over the period. The period from 1971 to 1981 saw a growth of approximately 95 percent, while the overall labor force growth was only 40 percent. The pace slowed somewhat after that; there was 21 percent growth from 1986 to 1991. This was greater than the 12 percent growth in the entire labor force. The relative growth is also reflected in the fact that in 1971 writers were .17 percent of the labor force while in 1991 they were .31 percent. Apparently much of the growth in the number of Canadian writers can be attributed to an exceptional growth in the number of women writers. During the decade of the 1970s the number of female writers grew by 162 percent, which was more than two and one-half times the rate of growth of women in the overall labor force. The growth in female writers continued over the next decade as well, until 1991, when almost half the Canadian writers (48.6 percent) were female. This compares to

49.5 percent female in the U.S. in 1990.

Canadian writers, like their U.S. colleagues, are much better educated than the typical member of the work force. In 1981 more than 42 percent had earned at least a bachelor's degree while only 10 percent of the entire work force had achieved an equivalent level of schooling.

Throughout the decade from 1980 to 1990, Canadian writers' average employment income was more than the average workers' and more than the average artists' total income. In 1980 they earned almost 25 percent more, and in 1990 they earned almost 20 percent more. Canadian writers earned more than other artists. In 1990 they earned approximately 16 percent more. U.S. writers, in 1989, also earned more relative to all artists but their advantage was somewhat less, approximately 10 percent. In both the U.S. and Canada the writers' advantage in earnings relative to other artists was also apparent when comparing full-time full-year writers and artists.

As in Australia, the gender difference in total income and earnings was somewhat smaller in Canada than in the U.S. In 1980 female Canadian writers had earnings that were approximately 63 percent of their male colleagues, and total income that was about 65 percent of the income of male writers. In the U.S. in 1979 the female to male ratio of income was approximately 46 percent. The Canadian female writers were better off relative to their female colleagues in the entire labor force where female total income was only 53 percent of male total income.

C. United Kingdom

In a recent study of artists in Wales,¹⁰⁴ writers were included in the survey but were not

¹⁰⁴Towse, *op. cit.*

the focus of the study, as is often the case. Writers were found to comprise 14 percent of the artist population in 1991, when the survey was undertaken, considerably larger than in the U.S. where they were only a little more than six percent of the artist population. They were found to have average incomes that were approximately 72 percent of the average for all artists (U.S. writers' mean earnings were greater than the average artists' earnings). Their earnings were 110 percent of the average. The Welsh writers' incomes were also found to be more skewed than the income for all artists in Wales. Compared to the number of writers with low incomes there were very few writers making significant amounts of money. This was similar to what was found in the U.S. In the U.S. only 4.1 percent of the writers had earnings in excess of \$90,000.

While not focusing on authors, the data confirmed results found in surveys of artists in the U.S. regarding the importance of human capital investments, especially as they relate to formal schooling, on artists' earnings.¹⁰⁵ The Welsh data confirms that human capital investments in training and experience have no direct influence on artists' earnings from their art work. It also suggests that while the amount of time spent working as an artist significantly impacts artistic earnings, the amount of education does not impact the time spent and therefore does not have a significant indirect impact on artistic earnings either.

Several other surveys of writers in Great Britain confirm that writers there are not very different from writers in the U.S. For example a study of the members of the British Society of Authors and the Writers' Guild in the early 1980s¹⁰⁶ found that only 17 percent of the writers who responded to the survey worked only as writers. It also found that 67 percent identified

¹⁰⁵Towse (n. d.) "Survey of Artists in Wales: Econometric Results."

¹⁰⁶Findlater (1982).

writing as a secondary occupation, up from 44 percent in the early 1970s. This certainly confirms that in Britain, like in the U.S., most authors are unable to earn a living without supplementing it with some other work, and that many of them accomplish this by working at more than one job at a time. The report also confirmed that the majority of Britain's authors at that time were not earning very much with approximately one-half of those responding to the survey earning less than one-half the national average wage at that time.

The study of the British Theatre Writers' Union undertaken in 1986¹⁰⁷ confirms the skewness in earnings, with almost 70 percent of their members earning less than 5,000 pounds per year, while less than 10 percent earn more than four times that amount. It also confirmed that the number of women playwrights is increasing at a rate faster than the number of men. The proportion of women playwrights had increased by more than one-third over a period of only three years.

D. France

As described above, the study of French authors was part of a larger survey of artists.¹⁰⁸ In fact, the use of the term author in the study referred all genres of the creative arts. Those in the study included writers, scriptwriters, and dramatists, who would form the core of the authors occupation in the U.S., along with music authors and composers, painters, sculptors, and art photographers. Clearly excluded are performing artists. The survey was undertaken in 1988 and, as discussed above, was restricted to professional authors defined as having earned a minimum income and belonging to either of two "social security agencies."

The information from this survey suggests that French writers differ from writers in other

¹⁰⁷ *Playwrights: A Species Still Endangered? - A Report* (1987).

¹⁰⁸ Vessilier-Ressi (1994).

parts of the world in some interesting dimensions, but with regard to some of the important economic characteristics they are similar. Two demographic characteristics of French writers suggest important differences. Only 20 percent of the writers are women. This is less than half the proportion of female writers in Australia, Canada, and the U.S. It is slightly more than the 15 percent female representation among all the French artists, but considerably less than the 43 percent in the total work force. It would also appear that French writers are old relative to other members of the work force. The median age for the writers was 46 years while for the entire work force it was 32 years. These two differences may be explained, at least in part, by the criteria used by the researcher to identify who was a "professional."

Several characteristics that French authors have in common with authors in other parts of the world are their education and their labor market experiences. French authors are apparently well educated relative to the typical worker in France. Approximately 50 percent of the authors "pursued courses of higher education" while only 14 percent of all workers were as well educated. At the other end of the distribution, only 8 percent of the authors stopped after completing primary school while the rate for the overall population was 40 percent.

French authors, even those defined as "professional" by the study's author, apparently need to work at more than one job. More than 30 percent of the writers pursued a "second trade" during the survey year, and more than 70 percent had done so some time in the past. In comparison to other French artists writers were much more likely to have behaved in this fashion, with only 10 percent of all artists working at a second job during the survey year, and only 40 percent having done so in the past. It is interesting to note that 25 percent of French writers disliked their second job, but an equal percentage indicated that they liked their second job.

E. Finland

Even though the institutional environment for artists in Finland is quite different than in the countries already discussed, there are considerable similarities between Finnish writers and writers in the U.S.¹⁰⁹ Finnish writers, like writers in the U.S. and in other parts of the world, are increasingly female. According to Finnish census data in 1970 40 percent of writers and critics were women. In 1990 the proportion female had increased to 45 percent. This was 10 percent higher than the proportion of females in other arts occupations,¹¹⁰ but it is somewhat less than the proportion of women in the work force. A potential explanation for the growth of women among writers suggested by the author is that "For women a literary career offers more equal opportunities for economic success than many other professions."¹¹¹

Finnish writers are like writers in other countries in that they are likely to be multiple job holders and not likely to be able to earn a living from their writing alone. In the Arts Council's 1984 survey of writers,¹¹² which includes fiction writers, poets, novelists and playwrights, only 22 percent indicated that they were full time writers. This distinction was very closely tied to working in a genre that is likely to receive financial support from a government program, e.g., prose writers and poets. Writers of children's books and dramas are not generally supported by public programs. The extent of multiple job holding is better reflected in that half the

¹⁰⁹Heikkinen (1989b), and direct communications with M. Heikkinen, Project on the Status of Artists, Research and Information Unit, Arts Council of Finland, November 1994.

¹¹⁰The other arts occupations are: visual artists (painters, sculptors, and graphic artists not working as employees), photographic artists (freelance photographers not working for newspapers or in advertising), musicians and composers, theater artists (actors, directors and stage designers), and dancers and choreographers.

¹¹¹Heikkinen, *op. cit.* 2.

¹¹²A recent survey of Finnish writers was completed in 1992 but the information from it is not yet available.

Finnish writers report a non-writing occupation for tax purposes. By comparison, only 5 percent of Finnish theater artists and 37 percent of Finnish visual artists behave similarly.

Writers in Finland were very much like other professional workers with regard to taxable income. In 1984 their average income was 3 percent more than the average for all workers with at least a university education, and 72 percent higher than the work force as a whole. This finding is consistent with data from the U.S. and other countries around the world. In comparison to other Finnish artists' incomes, writers fall in the middle. Using 1989 income for other artists, and an inflation adjusted income for writers, musicians and theater artists earned more than writers, but dancers and photographic artists earned less.

Female Finnish writers, like female writers in the U.S., earned less than their male colleagues. In 1984 female writers in Finland earned 68 percent of male writers' earnings. This was a lower percentage than that of all female workers who, on average, earned 72 percent of all male workers. The male-female earnings gap for writers was greater than that for musicians, theatrical artists and dancers, and about the same as for photographers.

TABLE 3-1
CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY - MULTIPLE JOB HOLDING
RATES: 1985, 1989, 1991
(Percent)

	1985	1989	1991
Authors	7.8	20.7	21.3
Actors	0.0	18.8	14.4
Announcers	6.5	22.8	14.8
Architects	9.5	8.3	6.2
Art Teachers (post-secondary)	29.3	26.3	24.9
Dancers	0.0	11.1	0.0
Designers	5.6	5.6	9.0
Musicians	12.1	6.5	17.1
Painters	16.8	13.0	7.1
Photographers	11.3	11.3	5.6
Artists NEC	14.5	8.8	11.0
All Artists	9.8	10.2	10.7
Other Professionals	6.9	9.0	8.2
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Current Population Surveys for May 1985, 1989 and 1991.			

TABLE 3-2
CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY - AUTHOR'S SECONDARY
OCCUPATIONS: 1985, 1989, 1991
(Percent)

	1985	1989	1991
Author	31.8		9.2
Actor		7.8	
Art Teacher (College)	35.0		
Designer		15.2	
Photographer		13.3	
College Teacher			25.7
Other Teacher		26.2	14.1
Other Writers			16.9
Other Professional		17.2	8.9
Sales		7.9	
Technicians		12.5	10.4
Operative	33.3		
Farmer			14.9
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Current Population Surveys for May 1985, 1989 and 1991.			

TABLE 3-3
CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY - AUTHOR'S PRIMARY
OCCUPATIONS: 1985, 1989, 1991
(Percent)

	1985	1989	1991
Author	7.3		6.9
Designer		3.5	
College Teacher	13.6	16.0	
Other Teacher	11.5	8.3	8.7
Other Writers	7.6	11.7	34.6
Other Professional	3.5	22.0	4.4
Managerial	13.8	20.3	31.9
Administrative (non-clerical)		5.1	
Sales	17.5		
Technicians	9.9		
Clerical	7.0	11.0	13.6
Operative		2.2	
Service	8.2		
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Current Population Surveys for May 1985, 1989 and 1991.			

TABLE 3-4
SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS,
PERFORMERS, AND
VISUAL ARTISTS

	Authors	Performers	Visual Artists	All Artists
Age	43.4	39.3	39.7	40.0
Education	17.3	16.8	16.6	16.7
Degree (%)				
High School	8.5	16.0	15.9	15.0
Associates	2.4	1.8	3.9	3.1
Bachelors	33.2	41.1	44.0	41.8
Masters	39.3	34.9	32.9	34.3
Doctorate	15.8	5.4	2.0	4.6
Artistic Training (Age)	16.2	11.1	16.8	15.1
% Who Are				
Married	68.4	65.8	71.7	69.0
Women	50.5	41.2	55.8	51.2
White	97.3	97.2	96.4	96.7
Black	.8	1.5	1.4	1.4
Other Race	1.9	1.4	2.2	1.9
Hispanic	.6	1.8	2.0	1.8
Veteran	19.7	18.2	14.4	16.0
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.				

TABLE 3-5
EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS,
PERFORMERS, AND VISUAL ARTISTS

	Authors	Performers	Visual Artists	All Artists
Attended Special Arts: (%)				
High School	3.3	9.2	11.3	9.8
College	7.9	44.8	43.8	39.9
Graduate School	14.4	33.4	26.6	27.0
Majored in Artistic Field: (%)				
High School	5.7	14.4	11.5	11.6
College	30.1	48.0	41.2	42.0
Graduate School	19.8	27.2	19.8	21.9
Special Artistic Training: (%)				
High School	18.7	36.7	25.2	27.5
College	28.7	15.8	15.0	16.7
Graduate School	8.1	4.9	4.4	5.0
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.				

TABLE 3-6

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS
OF NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS, PERFORMERS,
AND VISUAL ARTISTS 1981**

	Authors	Performers	Visual Artists	All Artists
Unemployed (%)	20.4	28.4	17.5	20.9
Times Unemployed	7.0	6.6	7.2	7.0
Weeks Unemployed	12.9	13.5	13.6	13.5
Arts-Related Job (%)	52.0	64.6	48.8	53.9
Non-Arts Related Job (%)	43.9	35.2	35.6	36.6
Full-Time Artist (%)	22.1	21.4	39.9	32.0
Artistic Hours Worked per Week	26.6	30.7	35.2	32.8
Weeks Worked	45.9	44.8	46.5	45.9
Weeks Worked as Artist	33.2	31.2	38.7	35.8
Weeks Worked in Arts-Related Job	16.5	24.2	14.4	17.5
Weeks Worked in Non-Arts Related Job	15.3	11.7	11.5	12.0
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.				

TABLE 3-7
AUTHORS' WRITING RELATED AND NON-WRITING
RELATED JOBS
 (%)

	Writing Related	Non-Writing Related
Professional (non-teaching)	13.8	25.3
Teaching:		
Primary and Secondary	5.1	4.3
College	25.1	2.5
Other	44.1	8.6
Managerial and Executive	8.7	14.8
Sales	1.5	6.2
Clerical	0.5	15.4
Craft	0.5	5.6
Operative and Laborer	0.0	6.8
Service	0.5	10.5
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.		

TABLE 3-8

**MEAN ANNUAL INCOMES OF NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS,
PERFORMERS AND VISUAL ARTISTS, 1981
(Medians in Parentheses)**

	Authors	Performers	Visual Artists	All Artists
Arts Earnings	4,271 (191)	7,527 (2,513)	6,351 (1,400)	6,327 (1,374)
Arts-Related Earnings	5,737 (0)	5,568 (831)	3,721 (0)	4,552 (0)
Non-arts Related Earnings	4,134 (0)	2,939 (0)	2,535 (0)	2,841 (0)
Total Earnings	14,771 (10,349)	16,383 (13,000)	12,938 (9,185)	14,116 (10,420)
Non-labor Income	2,270 (0)	1,245 (0)	1,466 (0)	1,504 (0)
Artist's Total Income	17,126 (12,090)	17,512 (13,600)	14,433 (10,568)	15,626 (11,700)
Total Household Income	29,526 (25,000)	27,373 (21,981)	26,801 (21,000)	27,233 (21,981)
Net Arts Earnings	2,286 (-221)	4,831 (896)	1,907 (-167)	2,721 (-50)
Net Total Artistic Earnings	7,980 (1,273)	10,474 (6,154)	5,795 (2,273)	7,368 (3,100)
Net Total Artist's Earnings	10,375 (3,940)	11,767 (7,885)	7,352 (3,532)	8,963 (4,600)
Net Total Artist's Income	14,633 (9,910)	14,741 (10,985)	10,088 (7,132)	11,980 (8,757)
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.				

TABLE 3-9

**MEAN EARNINGS OF NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS,
PERFORMERS AND VISUAL ARTISTS, 1981
(Medians in Parentheses)**

	Authors	Performers	Visual Artists	All Artists
Hourly Wage from Art Work	2.62 (0.00)	7.29 (2.36)	3.74 (0.63)	4.51 (0.71)
Weekly Art Earnings	93.50 (3.20)	231.56 (87.75)	138.88 (39.81)	156.21 (42.00)
Weekly Art-Related Earnings	146.95 (0.00)	140.85 (20.80)	106.87 (0.00)	122.28 (0.00)
Weekly Non-Art Related Earnings	98.11 (0.00)	68.23 (0.00)	66.78 (0.00)	70.91 (0.00)
Total Weekly Earnings	357.59 (243.18)	454.74 (322.55)	328.76 (233.29)	365.71 (260.00)
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.				

TABLE 3-10
AUTHOR'S METHODS OF JOB SEARCH AND MARKETING

Search Method	Percent*		Marketing Method	Percent*
Advertisements	34.9		Shows and Fairs	13.5
Friends or Relatives	55.0		Consignment in Showroom or Shop	13.9
Business Associates	46.6		Advertisements	8.5
Private Employment Agency	9.5		Agent	49.3
Booking Agent	13.2		Own Showroom or Shop	2.2
Student Placement Office	5.8		Other	49.3
Public Employment Office	7.9			
Other	45.5			
<p>* Multiple responses were permitted. Percentages do not sum to 100%.</p> <p>Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.</p>				

TABLE 3-11
SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS, PERFORMERS,
AND VISUAL ARTISTS: BY GENDER

	Authors		Performers		Visual Artists		All Artists	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Age	43.4	43.5	40.2	38.1	41.0	38.7	41.1	39.1
Education	17.6	17.1	16.7	16.9	16.6	16.6	16.7	16.7
Degree (%)								
High School	3.7	8.5	18.2	12.8	18.6	13.9	17.5	12.9
Associates	1.1	3.7	1.9	1.8	2.8	4.9	2.2	4.1
Bachelors	31.4	34.6	38.3	45.1	37.4	48.8	36.7	46.4
Masters	37.3	41.5	33.1	37.4	35.8	30.8	35.1	33.7
Doctorate	20.5	11.2	7.7	2.0	3.1	1.2	6.9	2.5
Artistic Training (Age)	15.8	16.6	11.8	10.3	17.5	16.2	15.3	14.8
% Who Are								
Married	69.2	67.7	69.6	60.3	73.3	70.4	71.6	67.6
White	97.8	96.8	97.0	97.3	95.3	97.3	96.2	97.0
Black	0.0	1.6	1.7	1.2	2.3	0.7	1.8	1.0
Other race	2.3	1.9	0.8	1.2	1.9	1.7	1.6	1.5
Hispanic	1.1	0.0	1.9	1.5	2.5	1.6	2.1	1.5
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.								

TABLE 3-12

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS OF NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS, PERFORMERS,
AND VISUAL ARTISTS BY GENDER 1981**

	Authors		Performers		Visual Artists		All Artists	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Unemployed (%)	18.0	22.5	25.7	32.0	15.4	19.3	19.0	22.6
Times Unemployed	7.0	6.9	6.7	6.4	7.2	7.1	7.0	6.9
Weeks Unemployed	13.6	12.2	12.0	15.3	14.2	13.2	13.1	13.7
Arts-Related Job (%)	49.5	54.2	61.4	69.1	46.6	50.6	52.2	55.5
Non-Arts Related Job (%)	43.5	43.9	34.8	36.0	34.7	36.4	35.9	37.4
Full-Time Artist (%)	29.1	15.0	25.3	16.0	48.3	33.4	37.6	26.8
Artistic Hours Worked per Week	28.5	24.8	32.2	28.9	38.7	32.6	35.1	30.7
Weeks Worked:								
Overall	47.8	44.1	46.9	41.8	48.2	45.0	47.7	44.2
Artist	36.2	30.5	34.7	26.3	41.3	36.5	38.3	33.3
Arts-Related Job	17.2	15.9	24.0	24.4	14.0	14.9	17.9	17.3
Non-Arts Related Job	16.3	14.3	11.8	11.5	11.7	11.4	12.3	11.8

Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.

TABLE 3-13

**MEAN ANNUAL INCOMES OF MALE NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS,
PERFORMERS AND VISUAL ARTISTS, 1981
(Medians in Parentheses)**

	Authors	Performers	Visual Artists	All Artists
Arts Earnings	7,025 (365)	9,856 (4,120)	9,472 (2,584)	9,189 (2,520)
Arts-Related Earnings	7,210 (0)	6,446 (831)	4,586 (0)	5,618 (0)
Non-arts Related Earnings	4,809 (0)	3,825 (0)	3,192 (0)	3,612 (0)
Total Earnings	19,317 (15,689)	20,553 (17,280)	17,555 (13,000)	18,786 (15,000)
Non-labor Income	2,025 (0)	1,244 (0)	1,872 (0)	1,678 (0)
Artist's Total Income	21,306 (16,486)	21,723 (18,000)	19,427 (15,000)	20,443 (16,486)
Total Household Income	29,987 (26,000)	29,012 (25,000)	26,103 (21,947)	27,580 (23,000)
Net Arts Earnings	4,463 (-150)	6,863 (1,525)	3,431 (-2)	4,644 (240)
Net Total Artistic Earnings	11,641 (4,884)	13,395 (8,927)	8,203 (4,318)	10,364 (5,615)
Net Total Artist's Earnings	16,272 (12,951)	17,387 (13,770)	11,535 (8,873)	14,118 (10,620)
Net Total Artist's Income	18,458 (15,000)	18,681 (15,292)	13,557 (10,200)	15,916 (12,387)
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.				

TABLE 3-14

**MEAN EARNINGS OF MALE NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS,
PERFORMERS AND VISUAL ARTISTS, 1981
(Medians in Parentheses)**

	Authors	Performers	Visual Artists	All Artists
Hourly Wage from Art Work	3.70 (0.18)	9.01 (3.40)	4.52 (0.96)	5.83 (1.37)
Weekly Art Earnings	128.63 (4.83)	208.97 (92.31)	161.15 (33.65)	170.45 (40.90)
Weekly Art-Related Earnings	165.22 (0.00)	159.65 (16.55)	136.62 (0.00)	149.53 (0.00)
Weekly Non-Art Related Earnings	111.01 (0.00)	86.66 (0.00)	79.83 (0.00)	85.81 (0.00)
Total Weekly Earnings	414.46 (317.04)	472.22 (375.82)	392.60 (290.75)	421.39 (329.72)
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.				

TABLE 3-15

**MEAN ANNUAL INCOMES OF FEMALE NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS,
PERFORMERS AND VISUAL ARTISTS, 1981
(Medians in Parentheses)**

	Authors	Performers	Visual Artists	All Artists
Arts Earnings	1,280 (2)	4,138 (1,112)	3,723 (900)	3,468 (763)
Arts-Related Earnings	4,148 (0)	4,299 (846)	3,024 (0)	3,521 (0)
Non-arts Related Earnings	3,417 (0)	1,657 (0)	1,997 (0)	2,094 (0)
Total Earnings	9,765 (7,807)	10,327 (8,705)	9,045 (6,597)	9,451 (7,455)
Non-labor Income	2,353 (0)	1,247 (0)	1,153 (0)	1,345 (0)
Artist's Total Income	12,611 (9,679)	11,525 (9,380)	10,257 (8,000)	10,868 (8,792)
Total Household Income	29,040 (23,080)	25,097 (19,783)	27,281 (21,000)	26,848 (20,541)
Net Arts Earnings	-92 (-300)	1,856 (-30)	617 (-243)	794 (-225)
Net Total Artistic Earnings	3,898 (300)	6,164 (4,157)	3,771 (1,362)	4,366 (1,836)
Net Total Artist's Earnings	7,635 (5,328)	7,850 (6,593)	5,985 (4,148)	6,635 (4,762)
Net Total Artist's Income	10,297 (7,440)	9,149 (7,774)	7,193 (5,162)	8,055 (6,132)
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.				

TABLE 3-16

**MEAN EARNINGS OF FEMALE NEW ENGLAND AUTHORS,
PERFORMERS AND VISUAL ARTISTS, 1981
(Medians in Parentheses)**

	Authors	Performers	Visual Artists	All Artists
Hourly Wage from Art Work	1.55 (0.00)	4.78 (1.42)	3.07 (0.41)	3.21 (0.33)
Weekly Art Earnings	27.77 (0.00)	131.03 (26.92)	72.16 (11.62)	78.41 (8.79)
Weekly Art-Related Earnings	128.59 (0.00)	113.98 (23.50)	83.30 (0.00)	96.59 (0.00)
Weekly Non-Art Related Earnings	85.35 (0.00)	42.10 (0.00)	56.62 (0.00)	57.02 (0.00)
Total Weekly Earnings	260.42 (158.03)	299.15 (223.46)	225.81 (164.00)	246.01 (173.78)
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper-Wassall's study of New England artists.				

TABLE 3-17
AUTHORS' WRITING RELATED AND NON-WRITING RELATED
JOBS BY GENDER
 (%)

	Writing Related			Non-Writing Related	
	Male	Female		Male	Female
Professional (non-teaching)	10.9	16.7		22.8	28.0
Teaching:					
Primary and Secondary	4.3	5.9		5.1	3.7
College	30.4	20.6		2.5	2.4
Other	39.1	49.0		10.1	7.3
Managerial and Executive	15.2	2.0		16.5	13.4
Sales	0.0	2.9		6.3	6.1
Clerical	0.0	1.0		3.8	26.8
Craft	0.0	1.0		8.9	1.2
Operative and Laborer	0.0	0.0		11.4	2.4
Service	0.1	0.8		12.6	8.7
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Alper- Wassall's study of New England artists.					

TABLE 3-18
SOCIO-ECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS OF
RCAC AUTHORS

	Authors (Primary)	All Authors
Age	40.9	40.3
Degree: (%)		
High School	1.3	1.5
Some College	12.3	16.4
Bachelors	35.3	40.4
Graduate	50.9	41.0
Age Started Artistic Training	16.4	16.0
% Who Are:		
Married	47.3	41.6
Women	60.7	56.0
White	90.3	89.8
Black	3.8	3.5
Other Race	3.6	3.6
Hispanic	2.3	3.0
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Jeffri's study of artists.		

TABLE 3-19
EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES OF RCAC
AUTHORS
 (percent, except as indicated)

	Authors (Primary)	All Authors
Formal Degree in Arts	63.2	63.0
Certificate	7.5	10.7
Professional School	16.0	23.6
Private Teacher	42.7	45.1
Mentor	42.5	43.4
Apprentice	11.1	17.5
Self-taught	80.0	78.4
Age Started Training (years)	16.4	16.0
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Jeffri's study of artists.		

TABLE 3-20

**LABOR MARKET CHARACTERISTICS
OF RCAC AUTHORS, 1989
(percent)**

	Authors (Primary)	All Authors
Unemployed	9.5	9.6
Other Jobs to Support Writing or Other Arts Work	88.0	85.0
Multiple Job Holder	49.1	51.4
Hours Writing or Other Arts Work:		
0-10	19.9	17.5
10-20	34.0	29.5
20-30	20.1	21.8
30-40	13.4	14.0
over 40	12.5	17.2
Hours Worked on Non-arts Job:		
0-10	17.1	19.3
10-20	14.6	15.7
20-30	23.7	23.5
30-40	26.5	25.2
over 40	18.1	16.4
Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Jeffri's study of artists.		

TABLE 3-21

**INCOMES OF RCAC AUTHORS, 1988
(percent)**

	Authors (Primary)	All Authors
Arts Income:		
\$ 0 - 500	48.5	42.5
501 - 3,000	24.3	23.5
3,001 - 7,000	7.5	10.5
7,001 - 12,000	8.6	9.1
12,001 - 20,000	4.4	6.5
20,001 - 40,000	5.4	5.6
over 40,000	1.1	2.3
Total Income:		
\$ 0 - 5,000	11.5	11.0
5,000 - 10,000	14.3	15.9
10,001 - 20,000	29.3	32.1
20,001 - 30,000	22.1	19.9
30,001 - 40,000	13.1	11.5
over 40,000	9.7	9.6
Grants - Awards Income (median)	\$ 871 (0.0)	\$ 838 (0.0)
Royalties, etc. (median)	\$1,374 (0.0)	\$1,107 (0.0)
Unemployment Income (median)	\$62 (0.0)	\$ 107 (0.0)
Writing income exceeds costs (percent)	42.7	43.3

Source: Authors' tabulations and calculations from Jeffri's study of artists.

TABLE 3-22
AUTHORS' NON-WRITING
JOBS
(%)

Professional (non-teaching)	41
Teaching:	
Primary and Secondary	4
College	36
Managerial and Executive	5
Sales	3
Clerical	3
Blue Collar and Service	1
Other	7

Source: Kingston and Cole,
op.cit., Table 3.3, 49.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Australia Council for the Arts (1991). *The Arts: Some Australian Data, Fourth Edition*. Sydney.
- Bielby, William T. and Denise D. Bielby (1987). *Pay Equity and Employment Opportunities Among Writers for Television and Feature Films*. Los Angeles, CA: Writers Guild of America, west, June .
- _____. (1989). *The 1989 Hollywood Writers' Report: Unequal Access, Unequal Pay*. West Hollywood, CA: Writers Guild of America, west, April.
- _____. (1993). *The 1993 Hollywood Writers' Report: A Survey of the Employment of Writers in the Film, Broadcast, and Cable Industries for the Period 1987- 1991*. West Hollywood, CA: Writers Guild of America, west, June.
- Burack, Sylvia K., ed. (1993). *The Writer's Handbook*. Boston: The Writer, Inc.
- Bradshaw, Tom (1984). "An Examination of the Comparability of the 1970 and 1980 Census Statistics on Artists." In William S. Hendon, et al (eds.), *The Economics of Cultural Decisions*. Akron: Association of Cultural Economics.
- Canada Council (1984). *A Canadian Dictionary & Selected Statistical Profile of Arts Employment, 1981*. Ottawa, Research and Evaluation.
- Charvat, William (1959). *Literary Publishing in America, 1790-1950*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Citro, Constance F., and Deirdre A. Gaquin (1987). *Artists in the Workforce, 1950 to 1985*. Washington: Research Division, National Endowment for the Arts.
- Colton, Michael (1994). "Sticking to the Script," *Boston Globe*, August 4.
- Compaine, Benjamin (1978). *The Book Industry in Transition: An Economic Analysis of Book Distribution and Marketing*. White Plains: Knowledge Industry Publications.
- Ellis, Diane C., and John C. Beresford (1994). *Trends in Artist Occupations, 1970-1990*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Filer, Randall K. (1986). "The 'Starving Artist' - Myth or Reality? Earnings of Artists in the United States." *Journal of Political Economy* 94, 56-75.
- _____. (1988). *Labor Market Earnings of American Artists in 1980*. Washington: National Endowment for the Arts.

- _____. (1989). "The Economic Condition of Artists in America." In Douglas V. Shaw, et al, eds., **Cultural Economics 88: An American Perspective**. Akron: Association for Cultural Economics.
- Findlater, Richard (1982). **Authors' Earnings: A Report**.
- Heikkinen, Merja (1989a). **Tilannekuva Kirjailijoista (The Social and Economic Position of Finnish Writers)**. Helsinki: The Arts Council of Finland.
- _____. (1989b). "A Situational Portrait of Writers: A Study of the Position of Authors in Finland (English Summary)," Helsinki: Arts Council of Finland, Publication no. 5.
- Jeffri, Joan, ed. (1989). **Information on Artists: Cape Cod**, New York: Columbia University/Research Center for Arts and Culture.
- Keens Company (1994). **Literature Field Overview Study**. Prepared for the National Endowment for the Arts, February.
- Kingston, Paul, and Jonathan R. Cole (1986). **The Wages of Writing: Per Word, Per Piece, or Perhaps**. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Robert Kominski and Paul M. Siegel (1993). "Measuring Education in the Current Population Survey," **Monthly Labor Review**, September, 34-38.
- Meredith, Scott (1987). **Writing to Sell**. New York: Harper and Row.
- Montgomery, Sarah and Michael Robinson (1992). "Visual Artists in New York: What's Special About Person and Place?," 7th International Conference on Cultural Economics, Fort Worth, Texas, October.
- Netzer, Dick and Ellen Parker (1993). **Dancemakers: A Study Report on Choreographers in Four American Cities**, Washington, D.C.: National Endowment for the Arts, October.
- Polachek, Solomon W., and W. Stanley Siebert (1993). **The Economics of Earnings**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Santos, F. P. (1976). "Risk, Uncertainty and the Performing Artist." In Mark Blaug, ed., **The Economics of the Arts**. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Statistics Canada (1993). **The Nation: Employment and Income by Occupation**. Ottawa, March.
- Statistics Canada (1993). **The Nation: Occupation**. Ottawa, April.
- Stinson, John F., Jr. (1990). "Multiple Jobholding Up Sharply in the 1980's," **Monthly**

Labor Review, July.

Theatre Writers' Union (1987). **Playwrights: A Species Still Endangered? - A Report**. London, October.

Towse, Ruth. "The Economic and Social Characteristics of Artists in Wales." Department of Economics, University of Exeter, undated mimeo.

_____. "Survey of Artists in Wales: Econometric Results." University of Exeter, mimeo, undated.

Vessillier-Ressi, Michele. (1994). **The Author's Trade**. New York: Columbia University School of Law, Center for the Arts.

Waits, C. Richard and Edward M. McNertney (1989). "The Incomes of Cultural Providers: A Review of Current Research." In Douglas V. Shaw, et al, eds., **Cultural Economics 88: An American Perspective**. Akron: Association for Cultural Economics.

Wassall, Gregory H. and Neil O. Alper (1984). "Determinants of Artists' Earnings." In William S. Hendon, et al, **The Economics of Cultural Industries**. Akron: Association for Cultural Economics.

_____. (1985). "Occupational Characteristics of Artists: A Statistical Analysis." **Journal of Cultural Economics** 9, 13-34.

_____. (1990). "When Is An Artist An Artist?" **Journal of Arts Management and Law** 19, 37-50.

_____. (1992a). "Earnings of American Artists: 1960-1980," 7th International Conference on Cultural Economics, Fort Worth, October.

_____. (1992b). "Toward A Unified Theory of the Determinants of the Earnings of Artists." In R. Towse and A. Khakee, eds. **Cultural Economics**. Berlin: Springer-Verlag.

_____, and Rebecca Davison (1983). **Art Work: Artists in the New England Labor Market**. Cambridge: New England Foundation for the Arts.

Zill, Nicholas, and Marianne Winglee (1990). **Who Reads Literature?** Washington: Seven Locks Press.